LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BR 162 .N4 1872 v.4
Neander, August, 1789-1850.
General history of the
Christian religion and

GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH:

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER.

TRANSLATED ACCORDING TO THE LATEST EDITION.

BY

JOSEPH TORREY,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

"I am come to send fire on the earth."— *Words of our Lord.*
"And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is." "But other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus."— *St. Paul.*

VOLUME FOURTH:

COMPRISING THE FIFTH VOLUME OF THE ORIGINAL
(NINTH AND TENTH PARTS OF THE WHOLE WORK).

ELEVENTH AMERICAN EDITION.

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CROCKER AND BREWSTER.
LONDON: WILEY AND PUTNAM.
1872.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871, by
CROCKER & BREWSTER,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY H. O. HOUGHTON AND COMPANY.

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THIS volume completes the translation of the General History of the Christian religion and church, as far as the work had been published when its lamented author was called away from the scene of his earthly labors. A sixth volume, as he himself intimates in the Preface to his Tenth Part, was to have brought the history of the church down to the times of the Reformation. What progress had been made by the author in preparing this interesting portion of his work for the press, I do not certainly know, though I feel strongly confident it must have been such that the last labors of the eminent historian will not long be withheld from the public. In a letter to the publishers of my translation, dated April 9, 1848, Dr. Neander writes that he was then occupied with this sixth volume; and it is well known, that one of the last acts of his life was to dictate a sentence of it to his amanuensis. As he had therefore been employed upon it for as long a time, to say the least, as had ever intervened between the dates of his earlier volumes, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the volume was left by him in a sufficient state of forwardness to admit of being finished without much labor. That it may be so finished, and the whole work thus brought down to the epoch to which the author in his later volumes was evidently looking forward as a resting-place, must appear highly desirable to every one who is capable of appreciating the minute and comprehensive learning, the scrupulous fidelity, the unexampled

candor and simplicity of spirit, the unobtrusive but pervading glow of Christian piety, which have thus far so eminently characterized every portion of this great work.

If such a volume should soon be given to the world, the publishers of the present translation will doubtless take measures to have it converted into English, and added as a necessary complement to their edition of Neander's Church History.

J. TORREY.

BURLINGTON, JULY 31, 1851.

DEDICATION

OF THE FIRST PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

TO MY DEAR AND HONORED FRIEND,

DR. RITSCHL,

BISHOP IN STETTIN.

EVER since I had the happiness to be thrown by official relations, when you were still here amongst us, into closer contact with you, and through your examinations over the department of practical theology, as well as by cordial intercourse, to become more accurately acquainted with your peculiar spirit, your way of interpreting the signs of these times, laboring with the birth-throes of a new age of the world, and your judgment as to what the church in these times needs before all things else, I felt myself related to you, not by the common tie of Christian fellowship alone, but also by a special sympathy of spirit. And when you left us, called by the Lord to act in another great sphere for the advancement of his kingdom, your dear image still remained deeply engraven on my heart. In your beautiful pastoral letters, I recognized again the same doctrines of Christian wisdom, drawn from the study of the Divine Word and of history, to which I had often heard you bear testimony before; and when I had the pleasure of once more seeing you face to face, it served to revive the ancient fellowship. Often has the wish come over my mind of giving you some public expression of my cordial regard. To the bishop, who in his first pastoral letters so beautifully refers the servants of the church to that which is only to be learned in the school of life, in History, I dedicate a part of the present work, devoted to the history of the kingdom of God. And I feel myself constrained to dedicate to the bishop of the dear *Pommeranian* church, that volume of my work in particular which describes the active operations of its original founder. That kindred spirit, even in its errors, you will greet with your wonted benevolence.

May the Lord long preserve you by his grace for his church on earth, and bless your work.

These times, torn by the most direct contrarieties, vacillating between licentiousness and servility, between the bold denial of God and the deification of the letter, needs such men, who recognize the necessary unity and the necessary manifoldness, and who understand how to guide free minds with love and wisdom, being themselves the disciples of eternal love and wisdom. May all learn from you not to hunt after new things which are not also old, nor to cling to old things which will not become new; but, as you advise in your first pastoral letter, to form themselves into such scribes as know how to bring out of their good treasures things both old and new, just as the truth which they serve is an old truth and at the same time always new.

With my whole heart, yours,

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, MARCH 5, 1841.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

I HERE present to the public the first part of the history of that important period, so rich in materials, the flourishing times of the Middle Ages; thanking God that he has enabled me to bring this laborious work to an end, while engaged in discharging the duties of a difficult calling.

I must beg the learned reader would have the goodness to suspend his judgment respecting the arrangement and distribution of the matter till the whole shall be completed. Notwithstanding that M. H———, in his recension of the two preceding volumes, in the literary leaves of the Darmstadt Church Gazette, has expressed himself so strongly, I have still thought proper, in this volume also, to incorporate the history of Monachism with that of the church constitution. No one, doubtless, except M. H———, will believe me to be so childish or so stupid as to have done this merely because it is customary to speak also of a constitution of Monachism. The reasons which have induced me to adopt the plan I have chosen, will readily present themselves to the attentive reader; though I am free to confess that another arrangement is possible, and that the reference to the Christian life is made prominent by me in the second section also, as it belongs indeed to the special point of view from which I write my Church History. I should have many things to answer to the above-mentioned reviewer, if the judgment of a reviewer were really anything more than the judgment of any other reader or non-reader. That the remark concerning Claudius of Turin was neither unimportant nor superfluous, every one may easily convince himself, who takes the least interest in a thorough scientific understanding of the history of doctrines. As to my theological position, I demand for that the condescending tolerance of no man; but shall know very well how to defend it on scientific grounds.

I regret that the second volume of Barthold's History of Pommerania did not reach me till after the printed sheets of the whole section were already lying before me.

I must direct the attention of the readers of my Church History, to the Atlas of Ecclesiastical History, soon to be given to the world by Candidate Wiltsch, of Wittenberg, which will prove a welcome present to every friend of the history of the church.

In conclusion, I thank my worthy friend, the preacher elect, Selbach, for the fidelity and care with which he has assisted me during the transit of my work through the press, and wish him the richest blessing in his new sphere of labor in the kingdom of God.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, MARCH 5, 1841.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO THE SECOND PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

I REJOICE that I am here able at length to present to the public the fruits of my favorite studies for many years, — an exhibition of the Christian life, of the development of the theology and of the history of the sects during the flourishing times of the Middle Ages. Would that the many new facts which ever and anon have presented themselves as the result of my inquiries, may serve, as some of my earlier labors have done, to call forth new investigations, which might tend to promote the cause of science by confirming that which I have advanced, filling up what I have left defective, or stating the other side of facts where I have stated but one side. I regret that my attention was drawn too late to Dr. Gieseler's Programme on the Summas of Rainer, and that I received it too late to be able to avail myself of it in treating the history of the sects. I regret it the more, as I am aware how much the labors of this distinguished inquirer have aided me in other investigations where our studies have happened to be directed to the same subjects. It is a great pity that, by this custom of academical programmes, many an important scientific essay, which published by itself or inserted in some journal might soon be generally dispersed abroad, is to many entirely lost, or at least escapes their notice at the particular moment when they could have derived the most benefit from it. The latest volume of Ritter on Christian Philosophy is a work also to which I could not of course have any regard. Also the Essay of Dr. Planck, in the Studien und Kritiken, J. 1844, 4tes Heft, on a tract cited in my work, the Contra quatuor Galliae Labyrinthos of Walter of Mauretania, is a production to which I must refer my readers, as having appeared too late for my purpose.

I have to lament, that of the ten volumes of the works of Raymund Lull, there are two which I have not been able to consult, as they are nowhere to be met with. If it be the fact that these two missing volumes cannot be restored, it is certainly desirable that some individual would do himself the honor of completing the edition from the manuscripts in the Royal Library of Munich.

I have not compared my earlier labors on the subject of Abelard, with this new representation of the man. By those writings of his which Dr. Rheinwald* and Cousin have first presented to the world, an impulse has been given to many a new inquiry, and new mode of apprehending the character of that celebrated individual.

In continuation of the present work there will follow, if God permit, an account of the times down to the period of the Reformation, in one volume.

* The *Archivarius* not barely of "Modern Church History," to whom I wish the most abundant support of all kinds in the very important undertakings in behalf of literature in which he is engaged, an edition of the collected writings of Valentine Andreae, one of the great prophetic men of Germany; the Acta of the council of Basle, after the plan of the one which Hermann of Hardt has furnished of the council of Constance; and the Continuation of his Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica, a work which must prove so important for the present and for future times.

I heartily thank Professor Schönemann, for the extraordinary kindness with which, as Superintendent of the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel, he has communicated its treasures for my use, without which it would have been out of my power to complete many an investigation of which the results are to be found in this volume. And in conclusion, I thank my dear young friend H. Rössel, not only for the care he has bestowed on the correction of the press, but also for the pains and skill with which he has drawn up the Table of Contents, and the Register.

A. NEANDER.

Berlin, Dec. 3, 1844.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME FOURTH.

FIFTH PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

FROM GREGORY THE SEVENTH TO BONIFACE THE EIGHTH. FROM A. D. 1073 TO A D 1294.

[First Division.]

SECTION FIRST.

EXTENSION AND LIMITS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 1–81.

1. *Among the Heathen.*

A. *Europe.*

Pommerania. Unsuccessful missionary labors of partially converted Poles, and of the Spanish monk Bernard 1

Early life of Otto; his activity as bishop of Bamberg; his call to be an apostle among the Pommeranians 3

Otto's journey through Poland; his reception by the dukes of Poland and Pommerania 6

The first baptized converts in Pommerania. Pagan festival at Pyritz; preparatory instruction and baptism of seven thousand; farewell exhortations 8

Favorable dispositions of Wartislav and his wife. Successful operations and planting of the first church in *Kammin.* Supposed divine judgment on account of breaking the Sabbath 9

Otto, and his timid companions, in the free city of *Julin.* Fury of the pagans; secret Christians there. Citizens agree to follow the example of Stettin 10

Arrival at *Stettin.* Religious condition of the pagan inhabitants. Embassy to Poland. Otto's influence; upheld by a Christian family 11

Boleslav's letter. Otto's method in destroying the monuments of idolatry. Death of a heathen priest 14

Otto in *Garz*, Lebbehn. *Julin* converted and destined for a bishopric. Success in Clonoda (Gollnow), Naugard, Colberg, and Belgrade 16

Visitation-tour, and return of Otto to Bamberg 16

Reaction of paganism in Pommerania. Otto's second missionary journey. His influence upon Wartislav in *Demmin.* Speech of the latter at the diet in Usedom 17

Influence of a pagan priest in *Wolgast.* Course of events there till Christianity triumphs 19

Otto's successful labors in *Gutzkow;* his discourse at the dedication of a church. Salutary example of Mizlav 21

Boleslav's military expedition renounced. Otto's interview with Wartislav. Otto's strong desire to visit Rügen. Attempts of Ulric to visit that island defeated. Otto's treatment of his clergy 24
Stettin, a town partly pagan, partly Christian. Witstack's conversion. His support of Otto. Otto's calmness amidst the infuriated pagans. Adoption of Christianity resolved upon in an assembly of the people. Otto's treatment of children. Dangers to which he exposed himself 26
Successful operations in *Julin*. Otto's return to Bamberg; he continues to be interested in behalf of the Pommeranians. German clergy and colonists in Pommerania 30
Rügen conquered by the Danes. Planting of the Christian church there by Absalom 31
Wendish kingdom of Gottschalk, under his successors. Spread of Christianity there 32
Vicelin's earlier life. His zealous and painful labors, in connection with Dittmar, among the Slaves. Religious societies and missionary schools .. 33
Liefland. Planting of the Christian church there. Missionary operations of Meinhard (first church in Yxkül). Crusades of Theodoric and Berthold against the Lieflanders. *Albert* of Apeldern. Riga made a bishopric. Brethren of the Sword. Esthland, Semgallen, Curland, christianized 36
Spiritual dramas. Theological lectures of *Andrew* of Lund. Sigfrid in Holm. Frederic of Celle martyred in Friedland. John Strick's behavior during an attack from the Letti. Impression produced by a spiritual song. Converts to Christianity come to a consciousness of their equal rights and dignity as men. Change in the character of the laws. Exhortations of William of Modena 39
Prussia. Missionary labors of Adalbert of Prague, and *Bruno Boniface*, till their martyrdom. Gottfried of Lucina, and monk Philip. *Christian's* labors, sustained by Innocent the Third (through his letters and briefs). Completion of the work by the German knights and brethren of the sword. Four bishoprics 41
Finland converted to Christianity 45

B. *Asia.*

Tartary. Activity of the *Nestorians* in spreading Christianity. Legend of the Christian kingdom in Kerait, under the priest-kings John. Historical basis of this story 46
Mongols. Empire of Dschingiskhan. Religious condition of the Mongols. Unsuccessful embassies of Innocent the Fourth 48
Influence of the Crusades. Embassy of Louis the Ninth. Statements of William of Rubruquis. His conversations and participation in the religious conference betwixt the different parties 51
The Mongol empire in Persia 56
Lamaism in the main empire of China. Report of Marco Polo, who enjoyed the protection of Koblaikhan 56
Missionary activity of John de Monte Carpino in Persia, India, China. His successful labors in Cambalu (Pekin). The Nestorian prince George becomes Catholic; reaction of Nestorianism after his death 58

2. *Among the Mohammedans in Africa.*

Relation of the Mohammedans to Christianity during the Crusades. *Francis* of Assisi in Egypt. Different accounts of him. Report of Jacob of Vitry 59

Science as an instrument for the spread of Christianity. *Raymund Lull's* earlier life. His conversion, and his plan of labor. His Ars generalis opposed to two parties. Relation of faith to knowledge. Linguistic missionary schools at Majorca. Lull's voyage to Tunis and its result. His Tabula generalis and Necessaria demonstratio. His labors in Europe, and second journey to North Africa (Bugia). His banishment; shipwreck near Pisa. His labors as a teacher in Paris; his threefold plan. Dies a martyr in Bugia 61

3. *Relation of the Christian Church to the Jews.*

The monk Hermann on the treatment of the Jews. False reports concerning them; fanatical behavior towards them. Bernard of Clairvaux defends them, and puts down Rudolf. Peter of Cluny hostile to the Jews 71

The popes their protectors. Innocent the Second and the Third. Briefs of Gregory the Ninth and of Innocent the Fourth 75

Points of dispute with the Christians. Objections stated by a Jew, and their refutation by Gislebert 77

Doubts and conflicts of the convert Hermann 79

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION, 82–292.

1. *Papacy and the Popes*, 82–197.

Corruption of the church, and reformatory reaction; Hildebrand's idea of the church as designed to govern the world 82

His course of development as conditioned by the times in which he lived. Gregory the Seventh (1073); complaints in the first years of his reign .. 83

Principles of his conduct; Old Testament position on which he stood. Predilection for judgments of God. Veneration of Mary. Papal and royal authority. Monarchical constitution of the church. Gregory and the laws. His legates. Annual synods. Care for particular nations. Gregory's incorruptible integrity. Persecution of witches forbidden. Gregory's views of penance, of monachism, asceticism. His liberality. 86

Different expectations from Gregory's government. The story concerning Henry the Fourth. Protests against his election. Letters missive for a reformatory Fast-synod (1074). Opposition to the *law of celibacy*. Gregory's firmness to his principles in the case of the opposition at Mayence, etc. His union with the laity and monks. His opponents. Letter to Cunibert of Turin. Separatist-heretical movements. Complaints against Gregory 92

Lay investiture forbidden. Gregory's proceedings towards Philip the First and Hermann of Bamberg 101

Henry the Fourth obeys the pope in respect to simony. Idea of a crusade. Henry violates the peace. Gregory's letter of admonition, and embassy. Gregory is impeached by Hugo Blancus. Gregory deposed at the council of Worms (1076). Henry's letter to Rome. Gregory's imprisonment by Cintius, and liberation. Ban pronounced on Henry. Impression produced on different parties. Gregory's justification of himself, refuted by Waltram. Diet at Tribur 103

Henry's journey to Rome (1076–77). Gregory's journey to Germany prevented. His relations with Mathilda. The penitents at Canossa. The host used as an ordeal. The judgment to be formed respecting Gregory's reconciliation with Henry. 112
Henry violates the peace. Rudolph of Suabia elected (1077). Gregory's ambiguous mode of proceeding. New ban pronounced on Henry (1080). Gregory deposed and Clement the Third elected. Henry in Italy prepared for peace. Gregory's firmness; his death (1085); his *Dictates* . . . 117
Continuance of the contest after Gregory. Victor the Third. Urban the Second. Philip the First's controversies concerning his marriage. . Firm and bold stand of Yves of Chartres, and his fate. Ban pronounced on Philip 121
Occasion of the *Crusades*. *Peter* the Hermit. Ecclesiastical assemblies at Placenza and Clermont 123
Speech of Urban the Second. Enthusiasm called forth. Different motives of the crusaders. Spiritual orders of knights. Pious frauds, together with examples of faith 125
Papal authority increased by the Crusades. Change effected in Urban's situation till his death. Death of the anti-pope Clement the Third . . . 128
Continued contests of Henry the Fifth. Robert of Flanders stirred up by Paschalis the Second. Bold letter of the clergy of Liege (by Sigibert of Gemblours) to Paschalis 129
Disputes with Henry the Fifth about Investiture. Compact at Sutri, A. D. 1110. New compact A. D. 1112. Reproaches brought against Paschalis the Second. Gottfried of Vendôme representative of the sterner party. Milder judgment of Hildebert of Mans and Yves of Chartres. John of Lyons. The tract of Placidus of Nonantula. Paschalis before the Lateran council. New disputes about investiture 132
Gelasius the Second, and the imperial pope Gregory the Eighth. Attempt to restore peace by the monk Hugo. Neutral stand taken by Gottfried of Vendôme. Concordat of Worms between Calixtus the Second and Henry the Fifth, A. D. 1122 141
The anti-popes, Innocent the Second and Anaclete the Second. Innocent, in France, supported by Bernard; healing of a schism in the church by the latter; his conduct towards William of Aquitania. Innocent triumphant in Rome 144
Opposition of the laity to the secularized clergy. Influence of the disputes about investiture 146
Arnold of Brescia; his education, particularly under the influence of Abelard; his asceticism, and fierce invectives against the clergy. His life in exile 147
Arnold's principles in Rome. His return under Celestin the Second. Lucius the Second. Anti-papal letter of the Romans to Conrad the Third 150
Eugene the Third. Bernard's letter to him. Eugene in France supported by Bernard. Great success attending Bernard's preaching of the crusades. His moderated enthusiasm. The awakening called forth. Twofold influence of Bernard. Opinions respecting the issue of the second crusade 152
Eugene's return to Rome. Bernard's four books, De Consideratione, addressed to him 157
Continuation of the quarrels under Adrian the Fourth. Letter of the Roman nobles to Frederic the First. Fall of Arnold's party. Arnold's death excused by the Roman court 161

Arnold's ideas continue to work. Conflict of the Hohenstaufens with the hierarchy. First expedition of Frederic the First against Rome. Adrian's letter to Frederic respecting the term *beneficium*. Step taken by Frederic on the other side. Reconciliation of the two parties in 1158. New difficulties. Correspondence between the parties. Adrian dies 1159 162

Alexander the Third, and the imperial pope Victor the Fourth. The council of Paris in favor of the latter in 1160. Victor's successors. Frederic the First's reconciliation with Alexander, 1177. The Lateran council in 1179 determines the order of papal elections 167

Thomas Becket made archbishop of Canterbury 1162; his difficulties with Henry the Second; his repentance at having signed the articles at *Clarendon*, 1164; his quarrel and reconciliation with Henry the Second; his assassination. Impression produced by what happened at his tomb. Henry's penance 169

Arnold's principles propagated by the Hohenstaufens. Henry the Sixth, and Celestin the Third 172

Government of Innocent the Third an epoch in the history of the papacy, 1198–1216. Motives to his great activity. Successful contest with John of England, 1208–13. Voices against him 173

Innocent in favor of Otho the Fourth; opposed to the party of *Philip*: afterwards in favor of *Frederic the Second* 176

Honorius the Third. Gregory the Ninth. Frederic's crusade. Compact with Gregory, and the issue of a new ban. Frederic's circular-letter. Gregory's accusations. Frederic's ideas of reform, or rather his skeptical bent of mind. Contest till the death of Gregory, 1241 177

Celestin the Fourth. Frederic the Second's contests, till his death, with Innocent the Fourth. His circular-letter after the ban passed upon him at Lyons 183

Robert Grosshead's discourse before the papal court at Lyons. His labors in England, and his unchecked boldness towards Rome 185

Legend concerning the death of Innocent the Fourth; Alexander the Fourth; Gregory the Tenth. Want of zeal for the crusades at Lyons, in 1274. Abbot Joachim opposed to them. Arguments against the crusakes combated by Humbert de Romanis 187

Raymund Lull's threefold plan in his *Disputatio*. His view of the crusades, and mode of procedure with infidels 190

Determinations with regard to papal elections revoked by John the Twenty-First. Celestin the Fifth, as pope. His abdication 192

Result of the history of the papacy under Gregory the Seventh. Unsuccessful efforts against the mischievous papal absolutism (interview of John of Salisbury with Adrian the Fourth). Bribery at the Roman court. Eugene the Third 194

2. *Distinct Branches of the Papal Government of the Church*, 197–205.

Personal labors of the popes. Different modes of conduct pursued by their legates. The Roman curia, as the highest tribunal. Capricious appeals to Rome limited by Innocent the Third 197

Relative dependence of the bishops. The form of oath taken by them. Influence of the popes in appointments to benefices. Complaints about exemption from the authority of the bishops. Pragmatic sanction of Louis the Ninth 200

Collections of ecclesiastical laws. Study of the civil law at Bologna. The

Decretum Gratiani. Ancient and more modern ecclesiastical law enriched by the decisions of the popes. Interpolated bulls. Raymund's decretals.... 203

3. *Other Parts of the Church Constitution*, 205–215.

Consequences of the Hildebrandian epoch of reform. Its slight moral influence upon the clergy. Abuses in ecclesiastical preferments combated in vain.... 203

Reformation of the clergy. Norbert's congregation. Gerhoh's Clerici regulares. Difference amongst the secular clergy. The latter as preachers of repentance.... 207

Fulco of Neuilly; his education, and influence as a preacher of repentance; his influence upon the clergy; his preaching of the crusades. Peter de Rusia, a preacher of repentance in opposition to the system of the church.... 209

Archdeacons. Officiales in the more general and in the more restricted sense. The bishops. Valuable labors of Peter of Moustier. Gerhoh opposed to the secular sword in the hands of bishops and popes. Titular bishops.... 211

4. *Prophetic Warnings against the Secularization of the Church*, 215–232.

Possession of Property injurious to the church. Prophetic element in the development of the church.... 215

Hildegard. Great reverence with which she was regarded. Her admonitions and counsels; her invectives against the clergy, and her prophecies.... 217

Abbot Joachim. His active labors; his ideas; his genuine writings, and the spurious ones attributed to him. His invectives against the corrupt court of Rome; against Paschalis the Second, and his successors. Worldly goods and secular supports injurious to the church. Inward Christianity; God, and the apostolic church. The antichrist (Patarenes), the destined instrument of punishment. The Hohenstaufens. The three periods of revelation, and the three apostles representing them. Joachim's view of historical Christianity. Form and essence of Christianity.... 220

5. *History of Monachism*, 232–292.

Monachism, and the tendencies of the times. Pious mothers, and other influences which served to promote it. Worldly temper in the monasteries brought about especially by the *oblati*. Salutary examples of such men as Ebrard and Simon. Motives of those who embraced monachism. Pardoned criminals gained, and other moral influences of the monks.... 232

Anselm on monachism and the worldly life. Early vows renounced. Various influence of the monks. Their sermons on repentance. Religious aberrations and conflicts. Admonitions of Anselm and Bernard.... 237

Yves of Chartres, Raymund Lull, and Peter of Cluny on the eremite life. Preachers of repentance. Worldly and hypocritical monks.... 241

Norbert, founder of the *Premonstratensians*. His miracles. Education and labors of Robert of Arbrissel. The Pauperes Christi, and the nuns at Fons Ebraldi. Robert's invectives against the clergy. Opinions respecting him.... 244

Cluniacensians. Predecessors of *Mauritius.* His exhortations against extravagant asceticism. His letters. 249
Robert, founder of the Cistercians. His successors. *Bernard* led to monachism. His rigid asceticism. His influential labors in *Clairvaux.* His relation to the popes. His miracles, judged by himself and by others. His exhortation to the *Templars.* His theology of the heart. On love, and its several stages. Constant reference to Christ. Different positions in Christianity. The spirit of calumny and self-knowledge 251
Differences betwixt the Cluniacensians and Cistercians. Bernard's Apologia. Spiritual worship of the monks. 263
Bruno, founder of the order of the *Carthusians.* Their occupations, and strict mode of life *Carmelites*, founded by *Berthold*. 264
Societies formed to take charge of the leprous, and other sick persons. Abuse of Christian charity. Order of the *Trinitarians*. 266
Law against new foundations. *Mendicant monks*, in their relation to the church. Didacus and Dominick in contest with the heretics of South France. Order of the *Dominicans* confirmed. 268
Conversion of Francis. His religious bent. Idea of the evangelical poverty; his reception with the pope and cardinals; his mortifications; sayings concerning asceticism, prayer, preaching. Mystical-sensuous element in his character. His love of nature. Marks of the wounds. *Minorites.* Order of *Clara*, *Tertiaries*. 270
Laborious and influential activity of the mendicants. Their relation to the clergy. Their degeneracy. Their influence on the youth, on the learned, and on men of rank. Louis the Ninth. 276
Influence of the mendicant friars in the University of Paris. Checked by Innocent the Fourth (his death); favored by Alexander the Fourth; attacked by William of St. Amour, who complains of their influence on Louis the Ninth. Papellards and Beguins. 282
Defence of the mendicant monks by Bonaventura and Thomas. Fate of William of St. Amour. Bonaventura as a censor of his order. The stricter and laxer Franciscans. Joachim's ideas as embraced by this order 286

FIFTH PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

FROM GREGORY THE SEVENTH TO BONIFACE THE EIGHTH. FROM THE YEAR 1073 TO THE YEAR 1294.

[Second Division.]

SECTION THIRD.

Christian Life and Christian Worship, 293–354.

General description of Christian life. 293
Individual traits of Christian life. Ambrose of Siena. Raimund Palmaris. Louis the Ninth. Elizabeth of Hessia. 295
Resistance to the secularization of the religious life. Pious societies of the Beghards, Papelards, boni homines, boni valeti. 302
Subjective view of the order of salvation. Justification as the interior work of making just. Fides formata. Twofold error resulting from this view; one-sided externalization, or spiritualization, of religion.

Voices of the church-teachers with regard to both errors. Marks of a truly Christian spirit 304

Shape given to preaching in the beginning of the twelfth century. Preaching in the spoken language. Preachers of repentance. Discourse of the abbot Guibert, of Novigentum, on the right method of preaching. Work of Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominicans, on the education of preachers. Example of pope Innocent the Third. Berthold the Franciscan, a preacher of repentance, at Regensburg and Augsburg 313

Attempts to translate the Bible in Germany and France; Bible-reading society at Metz. Dissolution of it. The Bible prohibited at the synod of Toulouse, 1229 320

Traces of infidelity, proceeding partly from rudeness of manners, partly from the revival of speculative culture, and especially from the influence of the Arabian philosophy. Frederic the Second. John Sans Terre. John Count of Soissons. Tract of the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy against the latter. Temptations occasioned by religious doubt. Examples of such conflicts 324

Dead, worldly faith. Hugo a St. Victore against it. Fanaticism and superstition. Superstitious veneration of saints. Elfeg of Canterbury. Abuse of relics. Work of Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, De pignoribus Sanctorum 327

Worship of the Virgin Mary. Doctrine of the immaculate conception. Festival of the Conception. Bernard of Clairvaux against it. Pothos a monk of Prüm attacks this festival in his work, "On the state of God's house." Epistolary dispute on this subject betwixt the abbot De la Celle and the English monk Nicholas. Thomas Aquinas, opponent of the exaggerated veneration of Mary. Raymund Lull's defence of the worship of Mary. Festival of the Holy Trinity. Abuses in the observance of festivals. Festum fatuorum, follorum 331

The *seven* sacraments; first mentioned by Otto of Bamberg, 1124. Exposition of the seven sacraments. Doctrine of the eucharist. Confirmation of the doctrine of transubstantiation at the Lateran council, A. D. 1215. Distinction of the accidents remaining behind, from the changing substance. Completion of the cultus and entire catholicism in this doctrine. Struggle against it in opinions and doubts of the sectaries. Secret adherents of Berengar. Older intermediate view, taking its departure from the relation of the two natures 334

Extreme point of *realistic* externalization. Thomas Aquinas. Inquiries of Innocent the Third in his treatise De mysteriis missae; his and Bonaventura's hypothesis of a retro-transubstantiation. Reply of the University of Paris, on the doctrine of the eucharist, to Clement the Fourth, A. D. 1264. The Dominican John of Paris's revival of the older dogma lying at the bottom of the relation of the two natures. His deposition from his office 339

Corpus-Christi day; originated in Liege; instituted first in 1264, by Urban the Fourth; again by Clement the Fifth, in 1311. Introduction of the bowing of the knee before the host, under Innocent the Third; made a law in 1217, by Honorius the Third. Abolition of the communion of infants. Distribution of the eucharist under one form, occasioned by the dread of spilling the blood of Christ; promoted by the idea of the priesthood. Doctrine of concomitance. Contest against the division of the Lord's supper. Division reprobated by Paschalis the Second. Provost Folmar of Traufenstein against concomitance. Neglect of the Lord's

supper by the laity. Ordinance of the Lateran council of 1215 with regard to this point. Encroaching corruption in the celebration of mass..... 341

Doctrine of penance. Necessity of separating the theological doctrine from the notions of the people. Distinctions of the theologians between church absolution and the divine forgiveness of sins; — subjection of this correct sentiment under the principles of the church. The three parts of penitence, first defined by the Lombards: Compunctio cordis; confessio oris; satisfactio operis. Extension of satisfaction to the future life. Gregory the Seventh, Urban the Second against the externals of penitence. Indulgence. Origin of general indulgences, by Victor the Third, by occasion of a crusade against the Saracens in Africa. Repeated preaching of indulgences during the crusades to the holy sepulchre. The council of Clermont under Urban the Second. Indulgences placed on a theoretical basis in the thirteenth century. Defence of them on the ground of a Thesaurus meritorum and of a supererogatory perfection of the saints. Distortion of the original opinion by the sellers of indulgences. Confession of William of Auxerre. Thomas Aquinas, Abelard, Stephen of Obaize, Berthold the Franciscan, partly against indulgences in general, partly against the abuse of them. Papal remissions, and canon of the council of Beziers against the latter. Ordinance of oral confessions by Innocent the Third, at the fourth Lateran council..... 347

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINES, 355–644.

1. ***Course of Development of Doctrines and Theology in the Western Church, 355–528.***

Newly awakened religious and scientific life in the eleventh century. Distinction of a more intellectual and a more religious interest. Question concerning the objective, or barely subjective import of general conceptions..... 355

Roscelin of Compiegne, near the close of the eleventh century, against the hitherto prevailing realism of Augustin, which had grown out of the combination of Plato's Universalia *ante rem* with Aristotle's Universalia *in re*. His explanation of general conceptions as *nomina, non res*. Analysis of the conceptions *part* and *whole*..... 356

Isolation of scientific efforts previous to the founding of the University of Paris in the twelfth century. Raimbert, nominalist at Lille; Udardus, realist at Tournay. John of Salisbury, near the close of the twelfth century, complains of the pride of dialectics. Strife between faith and speculation; example in Udardus; his work on original sin..... 357

Principles, theological and philosophical, confounded. Suppression of nominalism. Improbability of religious skepticism in the case of Roscelin himself. His designation of the three persons as *tres res*. Condemnation of his doctrine as tritheism at the council of Soissons, 1093. Recantation; flight to England; controversy with the English clergy on account of his Hildebrandian principles; return to France; death..... 359

Anselm of Canterbury represents the union of science and life. His early life; studies under Lanfranc in the monastery of Bec; made prior of that monastery after his master's death; his activity as a teacher; his principles of education; made abbot in 1078; called to England as archbishop of Canterbury in 1093; disputes with William the Second and Henry the First; relations with Urban the Second; travels through Italy and France; return to England; death..... 361

Anselm's character and intellectual bent. Unity of faith and knowledge assumed as the basis of his speculation. Instances of the strength of his intuition. Import of his attack upon nominalism. Adopts Augustin's principle with regard to the relation of theology and faith. Striving of his theology to satisfy the two main directions of the human mind. Fusion of the Christianity of the Bible and of the church. Mistakes the certainty and strength of his conviction for demonstration. 364

Separation of the main theological tendencies which had been united in the case of Anselm. Abelard; Bernard of Clairvaux. Bernard's monkish view of the relation of faith and knowledge. Threefold relation of the human mind to divine things. Corresponding distinction of the three provinces, of *opinio*, of *fides*, and of *intellectus*. Bernard's abandonment of scientific theology occasioned by Abelard..... 371

Peter Abelard of Palais, near Nantes, in Bretagne, 1079. His character. Controversy with the realist William of Champeaux, at Paris. Philosophical disputations at Melun, Corbeil, Paris. Passes over to theology. Competition with Anselm of Laon. Appears as a teacher in Paris. Enters the abbey of St. Denis. Scientific lectures..... 373

His work entitled Introductio in Theologiam; in which he bears down upon the enemies of the dialectic method. On the necessity of the explication of faith in conceptions. Different stages of faith. Distinguishes the essentially religious, and the religiously unessential, in the Sacred Scriptures; that which is necessary to religion and that which is less important. Distinguishes faith as a temper of the heart, and as dialectically apprehended. Gives a new shaping to the doctrine of inspiration. Theology and science. Distinguishes the mental acts, *cognoscere* and *intelligere*. Defends the idea of miracles. Endeavors to reconcile the natural and the supernatural. His overvaluation of the ancient philosophers on the subject of morals. Affirms their belief in a Redeemer..... 374

Fundamental principles of Abelard compared with those of Anselm..... 379

Opponents of Abelard. Walter of Mauretania his constant opponent. Charges brought against him by Walter. Abelard condemned at the council of Soissons. 1121. Abelard's return to St. Denis. His quarrel with the monks; takes refuge in Troyes; lives as a recluse. Theological lectures. Exposed to new persecutions. Accepts the place of abbot at Ruits, in 1128; resigns it in 1136. Lectures at Paris. Outbreak of a general controversy..... 380

His writings belonging to this period. New edition of the Introduction. Agreement between the ancient philosophy and Christianity. His injustice towards Judaism. Polemics against the undue exaltation of knowledge. Theology apprehended as relating to life..... 383

Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Disinterested love to God required. Fear only the beginning of wisdom. His agreement with Bernard on this subject..... 385

Abelard's ethical treatise entitled Scito te ipsum (principle that every action is in itself indifferent). The *intentio animi* constitutes the morality of an action. Adopts the doctrine of the church with regard to the actions of unbelievers. Sin and excitements to sin rigidly separated. The divine judgment of actions a distinct thing from all human judgment. His purer conception of penitence, and his attack upon the system of penance in his own age..... 386

Abelard's work on the history of dogmas, entitled Sic et non. Its aim. His freer notions of inspiration. Separates the divine and human elements in prophecy. Possibility of error in the apostles. Abelard's criticism

as opposed to the spirit of his times. Copies of Abelard's dogmatic lectures... 390
William of St. Thierry brings a complaint against Abelard before Gottfried of Chartres and Bernard of Clairvaux. Synod of Sens, A. D. 1140. Hypocritical behavior of Bernard. Berengar's sarcastic description of the synod. Abelard's system of doctrine condemned. He appeals to the pope. Letter of the council to Rome. Bernard's letter. Weakness of his charges. His letter to the cardinals. Abelard's letter to Heloise. Decision of the pope. Condemnation of Abelard. Comparison of his cause with that of Arnold of Brescia. Noble conduct of the venerable Peter of Cluny towards Abelard. The latter takes refuge at Cluny. His work of confession and defence. Discourse concerning the Supreme Good. Abelard's sickness and death at St. Marcel. Peter's letter to Heloise 393
Import of the controversy between Abelard and Bernard. Hugo of St. Victor at Paris from Ypres, near the end of the eleventh century. His education at Halberstadt, and the abbey of Hamersleben. Reception into the establishment of St. Victor, in 1118. Hugo representative of a mystical, intuitive, anti-dialectic school. Relation of his bent to that of Anselm. His Eruditio didascalica. Exalts the empirical sciences to the disparagement of philosophy. On the study of the Bible 400
Hugo as a champion for the independence of the religious province. Worldly consciousness, self-consciousness, and the consciousness of God, under the image of three eyes; two kinds of knowledge, one precursory, preceding faith, relating to the existence of the spirit; the second, developing itself out of it and setting forth the nature of the object; faith an affection (*affectus*). Certainty of knowledge in the case of the theologian and of the logician. Concerning the *merit* of faith. Progressive growth of faith to the certainty of experience..... 402
Different modes of estimating the degree of knowledge necessary to salvation. Hugo refers the whole to the measure of devotional feelings. Disputed question respecting the knowledge of the pious men of the Old Testament. Hugo differs from Abelard on the question concerning disinterested love. Similar views of Gerhoh of Reichersberg on the same point 404
Robert Pullein; his bent akin to that of Hugo a St. Victore. Made a cardinal by pope Eugene the Third. New controversy of Bernard with Gilbert Porretanus, archbishop of Poictiers, a man belonging to the dialectical school of theology. The latter accused of heretical views of the trinity before Eugene the Third. Division of opinions at the synod of Rheims. Bernard's hopes defeated 408
Peter Lombard of Novara, bishop of Paris, 1159; died 1160. His Libri quatuor sententiarum. Character of the work. Propagation of the school by Peter of Poictiers. Contests of the Schools with the church and the mystical tendency. Representatives of the former tendency. Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Walter of Mauretania; the latter's rude attack against Abelard and Gilbert of Poictiers, Peter Lombard and Peter of Poictiers, in the work entitled "Contra quatuor Galliae labyrinthos." Joachim. Innocent the Third decides in favor of Peter Lombard. Lateran council, 1215..... 409
The mystic theology. Its relation to the dialectic. Rupert of Deutz, Bernard's contemporary, author of an allegorizing, tedious commentary on the Bible. The Scotchman Richard, pupil of Hugo, prior of St. Victor, 1173. *Ratio* and *intellectus*. Exstatic intuition. Thoughts

and sayings of Richard. Objects of faith which are *supra*, and which are *praeter rationem*. Three stages or positions of the consciousness of God. The Meditationes of Guigo, a mystic, prior of the Carthusians... 411
Salutary influence of the Victorines at Paris. Jacob of Vitry complains of the licentious morals of the University, in his Historia occidentalis. Peter Cantor of St. Victor, bishop of Tournay, 1194. His ethics. Complaint against speculation. Archdeacon Peter of Blois, pupil of John of Salisbury, utters a similar complaint. Stephen, bishop of Tournay, writes a letter of complaint to Rome against divisions on matters of doctrine and desecration of the faith..... 413
Transition of dialectic theology from the twelfth to the thirteenth century. Alanus Magnus. His Ars Catholicæ fidei, dedicated to pope Clement the Third. His Regulae theologicae. Influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. Opposition to this influence. Admonitory letter of Gregory the Ninth to the University of Paris. Story about Simon of Tournay. General recognition of Aristotle..... 417
Difference of the effects produced by the Aristotelian philosophy in the earlier times and in the age of the schoolmen. Union of the Aristotelian with the Platonic philosophy, by Augustin. Pseudo-Dionysius. Translations of the Platonists. The alliance with the Aristotelian philosophy made possible by the distinction of the state of nature and the state of grace. Peculiarity of the new method. Its disadvantages. The two authorities of scholasticism, Aristotle and tradition..... 419
The Franciscans. Alexander of Hales, English; and Bonaventura, Italian. The Dominicans. Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas his pupil. Summa Theologiae of Thomas Aquinas. His Commentary on the Sentences..... 420
William of Paris. Roger Bacon. Persecutions which he suffered. His Opus majus. His opinions. Raymund Lull self-educated. Contest with the school of Averrhoes. His conception of an absolute method of science, *ars magna*..... 423
Progress of the theology of the thirteenth century..... 427

General Introductory Questions, 427–440.

Alexander of Hales. Different relation of knowledge and certainty in theology and in the other sciences. On the utility of theology. Redemption, the central-point. Similar views of Bonaventura and of Albert the Great. Point of departure of these theologians and Thomas Aquinas, the principle of an end above nature. This end defined, by the latter, as contemplation. Distinction of natural and supernatural contemplation of the Spirit reconciled by revelation. Total separation of faith and knowledge by the school of Averrhoes, controverted. Reason incapable of demonstrating the faith; capable of refuting objections to it. Use of analogies. Formal unity of theology in the idea of God. Definition of theology, agreeably to the principle of contemplation, as a theoretical science..... 427
William of Paris defines faith as a determination of the affections and will. Requires self-denial of the intellect. Doubt and conflict as belonging to faith. Faith the soul of the intellect. Agreement of knowledge and faith according to Roger Bacon. Practical life exalted above speculation. Moral philosophy the end of speculative. Theology the loftiest science. Agreement of Bacon with the other theologians on the subject of faith.. 432
Raymund Lull a zealous champion for the ultimate unity of faith and knowledge. His treatise on this subject, composed at Montpellier in 1304.

Different grades of the *credere* and the *intelligere*. Similar relation of God's essence to faith and knowledge. His disputation with a hermit. His answer to the question, How far theology is a science. Subordination of faith to knowledge. Denies the possibility of unlimited knowledge. His work on the contest between faith and knowledge. Constant precedence of faith to knowledge. His treatise entitled Contemplatio in Deum. Reciprocal demand of religious consciousness and scientific thought. Kinds of faith 435

Doctrine concerning God, 440–466.

Anselm's ontological argument. Necessity of distinguishing his fundamental ideas from their syllogistic form. Exhibition of his ideas in the book De veritate and the Monologium, which are identical with the corresponding ones of Augustin. Anselm's realistic view of a higher objectivity of thought. Thought as the copy of an existing truth. Self-causality of the idea of God. Intrinsic impossibility of denying the Divine existence. He neglects to distinguish the thought of the absolute and the consciousness of God. Contradiction between his affirmation of the unavoidableness of the presupposition of God and his proof of the actual being of God. Origin of the latter. The argument itself. Its refutation by the monk Gaunilo. Anselm's reply. Alexander of Hales's distinction of the *cognitio Dei in actu* and *in habitu*; of a *ratio communis* and a *ratio propria*, in reference to the argument of Anselm. Similar objection of Thomas 440

Monistic view of the world, occasioned by the work De divisione naturae, the Dionysian writings, Latin versions of works pertaining to the Neo-Platonic and Arabian philosophies, particularly the book De causis, translated from the Arabic and ascribed to Aristotle. Neo-Platonic doctrines of the last. Thomas's Commentary on it. More decided expression of the Neo-Platonic ideas, by Almaric of Bena, and his scholar, David of Dinanto 444

Almaric of Bena, near Chartres. Passes from the study of dialectics to theology. Asserts the oneness of the individual with Christ. His doctrine condemned by the University of Paris, 1204. This judgment confirmed by Innocent the Third. Almaric's recantation at Paris, 1207. and death. David of Dinanto defines God as the "material principle of all things." Sets up three identical principles: the first indivisible ground of the material world, matter; the first indivisible principle of the mental world, *nous*; and that of the eternal substances, God. God defined by Almaric, as the *principium formale*; by David, as the *materia prima*. Phenomenal things mere accidents, *sine subjecto*. Corresponding explanation of the eucharist. God incarnate in every man. Introduction of this pantheism among the laity by writings in the French language. The sect of the Holy Ghost. Predictions of William of Aria. Extirpation of the sect 1210. Theological writings in the French language forbidden 446

This *monism* attacked by the church theologians. The relation of God to the world according to Albertus Magnus and Thomas. Monistic mode of apprehending the Aristotelian philosophy, one intelligence in all beings. Severance of reason from faith. Pretended subordination of reason to the declarations of faith. Thomas opposed to this direction ... 449

Doctrine of the divine attributes. Unfounded charge brought against Abelard by Walter of Mauretania and Hugo a St. Victore, that he denied the omnipresence of God. Abelard's objections to the notion of a local

omnipresence. He extends the idea of omnipresence also to time. View of this attribute according to the scholastic theologians, as the divine efficiency pervading space..... 450

Determination of the idea of almighty power by the theologians of the twelfth century. Anselm limits the divine freedom to that which is worthy of God. The conception of divine necessity taken up into that of an immutable will. Abelard resolves divine necessity into love. His respect for the religious interest. Development of his views in the Sentences. More moderate in the Apology. Hugo's distinction of divine will in itself, as *beneplacitum Dei*, from its historical manifestation, as *signum beneplaciti*. His view of an overgrasping omnipotence. Abelard controverted by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century..... 452

Doctrine of the Trinity. Method of Augustin adhered to. Point of departure, analogy between the created and the Supreme Spirit. Anselm's comparison of human self knowledge with the Word, in whom finite being is created, of man's thought of himself with the Father. Procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son. Defence of the Western doctrine of the Holy Spirit against the Greeks at Bari in Apulia, 1098. Abelard's departure from the method of analogy; treats the doctrine of the trinity as a necessary idea of reason, — God as almighty power, wisdom, love — Father, Son, and Spirit. Attempt to reconcile the doctrine as held by the Western and by the Oriental church. Similar explanation of this doctrine by Richard a St. Victor. Hugo, Richard, Alanus..... 457

Controversies on the trinity, growing out of opposite theories respecting general conceptions. Charge of tritheism brought against Gilbert Porretanus. Anti-Sabellian distinction made by Porretanus of the *substantia quae est Deus* from the *substantia qua est Deus*. Unprofitableness of this dispute. Rejection of the symbol proposed by Bernard. Inapplicability of the logical categories to God, according to Abelard and Peter of Lombardy..... 461

Prosecution of the doctrine of the trinity in the thirteenth century. Alexander of Hales. Self-communication of God after his nature, in generation; after his will, in love. Albert the Great: *formans formatum, spiritus rector formae*. Thomas Aquinas rejects the argument from reason. Analogy of the divine creation with the Trinitarian distinction of God within himself. The *processio amoris* conditioned on the *processio intellectus verbi*. The generation of the Son; procession of the Spirit. Mode of apprehending the creation of the world as a process of nature, excluded by the doctrine of the trinity. Lull: Divine *principle* of all existence, the Father; *medium*, the Son; *end*, the Spirit. The trinity considered as the exhaustion and fulfilment of perfect being..... 462

Doctrine of creation. Thomas Aquinas: Beginning of creation a bare matter of faith. Considerate judgment respecting the hypothesis of an eternal creation. End of the creation. Bonaventura's definition of this end as the glory of God, not the good of the creature..... 466

Conception of the miracle. Reconciliation of this idea with the doctrine concerning God and the world. Abelard's distinction of a κόσμος νοητός and κόσμος αἰσθητός, of the plan of the world and the course of the world. Evolution of the powers originally implanted in the world, and entrance of new ones in miracles. Abelard opposed to philosophical monism. On the cessation of miraculous works in his own times. 466

Middle theory of Abelard passes over to the thirteenth century. Alexander of Hales. Distinguishes nature as plastic matter and formal law.

Defines the miracle as the exposition of that which is concealed in nature. Albertus Magnus: *Primordiales rerum causae simpliciter;* nature, as the comprehended sum of all the possibilities laid within it; and nature, as the totality of all the actualities determined by its self-development. *Contra*, *praeter* and *supra naturam* distinguished. Similar determinations of Thomas Aquinas. Sayings of Raymund Lull. Designates the Christian age of the world as the age of miracles, in contradistinction to the antique world. Roger Bacon: Miraculous power residing in the Word. . 469

Foreknowledge and predestination. Liberty of the creature sacrificed to the Augustinian system and a monistic speculation. Sophistic concealment of the final result common to all the speculations on this subject. Anselm's treatise on predestination. Show of freedom which arises from the temporalization of the eternal. Evil excluded from the foreknowledge of God as non-existent. Hugo: Freedom of the will in itself; limitation of the individual will by the order of the world. Alexander of Hales: *necessitas antecedens* and *consequens*. Conception of "providence" and "fate;" the one, as the arrangement of things in the divine understanding; the other, as their incorporation in actual reality. Freewill included under the latter. Extension of God's knowledge also to evil. Evil an element in the harmony of the universal whole. Albertus Magnus: Harmony of providence, fate, and freedom..... 474

Climax of the monistic denial of liberty in the determinations of Thomas Aquinas. *Necessity* of free actions, as contemplated from their *highest* and *ultimate*, *contingency* of them as contemplated in their *proximate* causes. God's will, that some things should be necessary after a *necessary* others after a *contingent* manner, — connected with this, unconditional predestination. God's goodness, ultimate ground of both election and reprobation. Reference of this relation back to the necessary manifoldness in the universe. Plan of the world in the divine understanding distinguished from its execution in the actual world. Identity of knowing and being in God. Thomas vacillates betwixt pantheistic monism and the theistic contemplation of the world. The irresistible will of God as necessitating man to freewill..... 477

Raymund Lull. The questionable relation united with that of creation and preservation. Lull endeavors to exclude all constraint from predestination. Concedes the incompatibility of the doctrine of predestination with ethics..... 481

Connection of the scholastic anthropology with that of Augustin; particularly in the application of the idea of grace to the primeval state of man. Anselm controverts the definition of freewill as the faculty of choice between good and evil. Positive conception of freedom. This conception more precisely defined by the view of man's primeval state. "Merit" of the angels who did not fall; their confirmation in goodness. Pullein's doctrine with regard to the original bare faith, and the posterior intuition of the angels. Twofold employment of the term faith. Clear separation of the two meanings by Hugo. The *concursus*, and the more limited grace. Distinction of grace as *gratia cooperans* in the primeval state, and *operans* in the state of corruption. Peter of Lombard supposes a will without power, in the primeval state, rendered active by grace. Peter of Poictiers interprets the image of God as referring to the natural powers of the soul. *Bona naturalia* and *bona gratuita*. State of man before and after the bestowment of grace in paradise..... 485

Influence of these distinctions upon faith and morals. Principle of superhuman virtue. Agreement in this respect with the fundamental princi-

ple of Aristotle's ethics. The abbot Peter of Celle, bishop of Chartres, rejects this view. Alexander of Hales: *Pura naturalia* and *informatio*. Distinction made by the theologians of the thirteenth century between a *gratia gratis data* and a *gratia gratum faciens*. The latter acquired by the *meritum de congruo*, as distinguished from the *meritum de condigno*. Human nature in itself as *informis negative*, not *privative*. Its need of *gratia informans*, not *reformans*. Alexander holds to a twofold love to God, human and superhuman; supposes a supernatural reconciliation between the natural state and the supernatural destination of man 487

Destination of man, according to Bonaventura, to serve the glory and the manifestation of God. Creation in the image of God, and likeness to God, grounded in the intellect and the affections of man. Transition from the hypothesis of a twofold grace, by Alexander, to the succeeding doctrines. Deviation of the Dominican Thomas Aquinas from the Franciscan Alexander, in the hypothesis of a coexistence of nature and grace in the original state. His view of original righteousness. Harmony between the higher and lower powers. Immediate surrendry of man, at his first creation, to the divine 490

Augustinian exposition of the influence of the first sin. Fall of the entire race in one exemplar, according to Anselm. *Peccatum naturale* and *personale*. Similar connection of ideas in the work of Odo of Tournay, De peccato originali. Abelard wavers betwixt his own principles and the church doctrine. Traces the fall to the natural conflict betwixt reason and sense. In opposition to the doctrine of Augustin, supposes the transfer of punishment only to the posterity of Adam. Reduces the whole finally to God's unlimited will. The difference between good and evil made to depend on the divine will, in contradiction to his own theory respecting the divine omnipotence. Case of unbaptized infants. Vague defence of his doctrine in his Vindication. Original sin more precisely defined by means of the assumption of *bona naturalia* and *gratuita*. Peter of Lombardy: corruption of the former, loss of the latter. Thomas rejects Traducianism. All partake of Adam's sin by virtue of a community of nature. Original sin as *inordinata dispositio, languor naturae*. Question about a *posse non peccare* or a *peccare non posse*, in respect of the sinlessness of Christ. Twofold view in Abelard. Comparison of the immutable divinely human unity in Christ, with the transitory relation of the Spirit to the prophets. Possibility of sin in Christ as man; impossibility as God-man. Perfect humanity of Christ insisted on. Peter Lombard's distinction of natural from sinful weakness, *passio* and *propassio* 492

Doctrine of redemption. Neglect of this doctrine in the earlier times. Germ of its scholastic shape in Augustin. Prominence given by him to the subjective side. His judgment with regard to the possibility of another form of redemption; this contemplated from the point of view of the divine omnipotence. Anselm's attempt to prove the necessity of the actual form. All sin considered as withholding from God the honor due to him. Punishment as a moment in the divine order of the world. Necessity of more than equivalent reparation for sin. Impossibility of such satisfaction on the part of man. Necessity thence arising of a God-man as mediator. Separation of the ethical from the dogmatical side of the death of Christ. Its conformity to nature founded in the human relations. His unmerited and hence meritorious death. Christ, the self-sufficient, abdicates this merit in favor of fallen humanity 497

Unconditional significance of the "active satisfaction" in this theory, while the "passive" retires wholly out of view. The fact of redemption incomprehensible to finite conception. Opposition betwixt Anselm and Abelard in the treatment of this doctrine. Abelard represented, without good grounds, as an heretic before Innocent the Second, by Bernard. The latter deprecates speculation on this subject, and considers the whole work of redemption as a mystery. Views of Robert Pullein nearly resemble those of Abelard. Peter Lombard warns against anthropopathical misconceptions. The theory of Anselm passes down. The theory set up of vicarious satisfaction by suffering, to which theory Anselm was a stranger. Complexity of his view. View of Innocent the Second, independent of Anselm's exposition. Regards the work of redemption as the reconciliation of divine justice and mercy. Aquinas. Necessity of the punishment of death. The redemption as an act of love, as an example of humility, as a removal of the distance betwixt God and man. William of Paris. Adopts the views of Anselm. The remedy as counterpart to the disease. The first sin pride, disobedience, and cupidity; corresponding character of the redemption. Likeness to God, the chief end of man's nature, made possible by the union of God with human nature..... 500

Resumption of a point of view which had been lost sight of ever since the time of the Gnostics and of the Antiochian school, viz: The work of redemption considered in its relation to the whole system of things. Significance of the incarnation, aside from the fact of sin, and considered in its bearing on the perfection of the universe. Bonaventura, separating the interest of religion from that of the reason, proposes two possible answers to the question respecting the import of redemption. Thomas Aquinas expresses himself doubtfully. Raymund Lull determines the question in opposition to the two latter..... 507

Appropriation of the redemption. The Augustinian doctrine of justification, as the inward making just, continues to maintain its ground. This subjective view favorable to the guardianship of the church. Peculiar soterological views of Bernard. Lays stress upon the objective side in justification. Eternity of divine justification, which is temporal in its manifestation. Derives sanctification from justification. Indecision between the two different views. Both confounded together..... 508

Interior principle of the fellowship of life with Christ according to the theologians of this century. A dead faith distinguished from faith working by love. Anselm; dead faith as extrinsic of its object, living faith as interpenetrated by it. Peter Lombard: *Credere in Deum, credere Deum, credere Deo,*— the first, faith inspired by love, *fides justificans, fides formata;* the second, dead faith, corresponding to the Aristotelian inorganic matter, *fides informis;* these determinations, as the foundation of the doctrine of the thirteenth century. Dead faith, gift of miracles, of prophecy, and faith of the affections separated by Thomas, and distinguished as *gratia gratis data* and *gratia gratum faciens.* The bent of the will to the divine, love — the soul, the *forma fidei.* Point contested whether the *fides informis* is raised to the *formata*, or extinguished by it. Aquinas affirms the former, as faith is essentially an intellectual act. Similar judgment of Lull..... 510

Thomas Aquinas apprehends justification as an infusion of grace, forgiveness of sins as a consequence of this infusion. Practical consequence of this order of salvation. Dependence of salvation on the subjective operation of grace. Uncertainty in regard to the present existence

of such an operation. Alexander denies that any infallible mark exists of the state of grace. Thomas takes the same view; because the author of grace, God himself, cannot be an object of experience. Freedom from mortal sin, as a mark of the state of grace. Only *certain* mark, a particular revelation. Anxiety of conscience, over-excitement of religious feelings, dependence of the pious consciousness on the external church, on the *gratia justificans* of the sacraments, as the fruit of this uncertainty..... 514

Relation of freedom and grace. Coincidence with Augustin. Reservation in regard to the denial of freewill. Anselm's dialogue on the free-will and treatise on foreknowledge and predestination. Capacity for good, even in the state of the corruption of the will. This faculty operative only in the redeemed will. Robert Pullein wavers betwixt the Augustinian and the milder view. So the other systematic theologians of the twelfth century. More human theory of the Mystics. Bernard's work, De gratia et libero arbitrio. Distinction of freedom *as to fact* under grace, and inalienable freedom *as to bare form*. Moral nature of man founded in the latter. Dependence of the efficiency of grace on the free-will. Ultimate dependence of freewill on grace. Still a limitation of these concessions by the view of original sin. . Richard a St. Victore unites the Augustinian doctrine of prevenient grace with the strongest expressions in favor of freewill..... 515

The two main antithetic directions of the thirteenth century. The more liberal one of the Franciscans, represented by Alexander of Hales; and the ultra Augustinian, by the Dominican Albert the Great and Aquinas. Alexander gives prominence to free recipiency. His comparison of the two paupers. Thomas likewise falls back upon a necessary recipiency, but traces this to predestination. The communication of grace conditioned on the moral recipiency of the creature, as *meritum de congruo*. 518

Systems of morals. Fusion of system of morals with that of faith. Principal work on ethics, the Summa of Thomas Aquinas. Subordinate value of the Summa de virtutibus et vitiis of Nicholas Peraldus. The De virtutibus of William of Paris and the Contemplatio in Deum of Raymund Lull. The peculiar Christian consciousness, the might of tradition and the authority of the Aristotelian ethics, as the three main points of departure of the scholastic systems of morals. Dualistic character of the Aristotelian and of the accessory New-Platonic ethics..... 519

Important distinction of ante-Christian and Christian, natural and supernatural. Cardinal and theological virtues. Thomas conceives of virtue as the requisite aptitude of the rational essence to attain to its proper end. Twofold nature of this end. Happiness based on natural faculties corresponding to natural reason, and supernatural communion with God. Inner necessity of the cardinal virtues, in their number of four: Knowledge of the *bonum rationis — prudentia;* external realization of the *ordo rationis — justitia;* resistance to the passions opposed to the *ordo rationis — temperantia;* and to those which draw away from it, *fortitudo*. The theological virtues. "Intellect" determined as faith by the appropriation of revealed truth. Will, in its direction to the true end, as hope; and its union and assimilation with it, as charity. Purity and simplicity of the Christian principle disturbed by this division..... 520

The seven spiritual gifts, as media of union between the cardinal and theological virtues. William of Paris divides the virtues into natural, acquired, and virtues of grace. Apprehends purely human virtue as purely imaginary. Aristotelian point of view, the superhuman. Appropriation

of Plotinus's distribution of virtues, prototypical, purifying, and political. On the assumption of purifying virtues, Thomas Aquinas modifies the old notion of the cardinal virtues and considers *prudence* as contempt of the world and aspiring after God; *temperance*, as abstinence from the things of sense; *fortitude*, as imperturbation at this separation from the world; *justice*, as resignation to it. The end to be striven after. Virtue as pure contemplation. Fasts and mortifications united with the *temperantia infusa*..... 522

Contradictions in Thomas Aquinas's system of ethics flowing from the combination of heterogeneous elements. Rejects actions indifferent; things to be permitted. Supposes a supererogatory perfection. The *adiaphoron*, as that which is not as yet determined. Refers *precepts* to that which is necessary to salvation; *counsels*, to that which contributes to its easier attainment. Want of true connection between virtue in *struggle with*, and virtue *appropriating* the world. Self-will above law, as the highest stage of morality. Surreptitious introduction of this stage of perfection also into the province governed by the *praeceptum*. *Consilium particulare*. Adoption of the unchristian μεγαλοψυχια of Aristotle as *magnanimitas quae modum rationis ponit circa magnos honores*, this referring to the divine gifts of grace, — humility, to the sense of one's own deficiency. With the former, comes contempt of those destitute of grace. Right and wrong in this theory. Thomas's sensible inquiry into the relation of the *actus exterior* and the *intentio*. Perfect will, as the will energetic in act.. 524

2. *History of the Greek Church in its Relation to the Latin*, 528–551.

Stiffness and uniformity of the Greek church. Secular spirit of monachism. Self-mortifications. Mock holiness. Rudeness of the monks. Literary college under the Comnenes. Nicetas, bishop of Chonae; Euthymius Zigabenus; Nicholas Methone, theologians of the twelfth century..... 528

Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica, author of the Commentary on Homer..... 530

Dogmatizing spirit of the Greek emperors. Imperial dogmatism of Manuel Comnenus..... 533

Misunderstanding betwixt the Eastern and Western church increased by scholasticism, the organization of the papacy, and the Crusades. Council of Bari, 1098, under Urban the Second, on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Conference between bishop Anselm of Havelsberg and Nechites archbishop of Nicomedia, president of the college, 1146, under John Comnenus the Second..... 536

Desire of a general council. Founding of the Western empire at Constantinople 1204, the occasion of new jealousies. Political motives for union. Letter of the patriarch Germanus, of Constantinople, to Gregory the Ninth. Embassy and letter of Gregory to Constantinople in 1233. Efforts of Nicephorus Blemmydes to bring about a union of the churches. Manly conduct of this abbot..... 538

Restoration of the old empire at Constantinople by Michael Paleologus in 1261. He falls out with the patriarch Arsenius. Zeal of the emperor for the union of the churches. Resistance of the *archivar* John Beccus. Change of his views. Decree of union at the council of Lyons, 1274. Its introduction at Byzantium. Misunderstandings between the emperor and Beccus. Ban pronounced by Martin the Fourth against Michael, 1281..... 542

Breaking up of the union under Andronicus, 1282. Retirement of Bec-

cus. His controversies with the enemies of the union between the churches. His death, in 1298. The party of the Arsenians..... 548

3. *The Sects that stood forth in Opposition to the Hierarchy*, 552–644.

The Bogomiles. Their connection with the older Greek sects. Bulgarian origin. The doctrine concerning Satanael. His apostasy. Creation of the world and of man. Seduction of Eve by Satanael. Emanation of the Logos; Michael, in the year 5550. Docetic incarnation of the Logos. Emanation of the Spirit..... 552

Rejection of water baptism. The *consolamentum*. Rejection of the sacrifice of the mass; of the worship of Mary, images, and saints. Aversion to places of worship. Canon of the Bogomiles..... 556

Attempts to suppress them. Constantine. Chrysomalos; condemned at Constantinople, 1140. Mystical writings of Chrysomalos. The monk Niphon. Philippolis and Alexiopolis..... 559

The Catharists; origin; different names. Sterner and milder party of this dualistic sect..... 565

Doctrines of the sterner dualistic party. The two creations. Fall of Satan and of his angels. Preëxistence and transmigration of souls. Theory of subordination. Docetism. Reunion of fallen souls with their heavenly spirit. Interpretation of Scripture..... 566

Doctrine of the Catharists of the milder class. Refer evil to an apostasy of spirits. Doctrine of Adam. Anthropology. Their views of the Old Testament. Less rigid doctrine of subordination. Docetic Christology. Dualistic Eschatology..... 572

Agreement of both parties in combating the outward formality of the church. Their doctrine of baptism. The sect itself falls into the fault of externalization. Their relation to Protestantism..... 575

Ascetic system of morals. *Credentes*, *perfecti*, and *auditores*..... 579

Diffusion of the Catharists. Trial of Armanno Punzilovo of Ferrara. Treatment of the Catharists on the part of the church. Courageous deaths of the condemned. The Catharist popes: Nequinta in South France, with his council at Toulouse in 1167, and Bartholomew in Bulgaria sometime after 1223..... 582

The Pasagians. Disappearance of the dualistic element in the later sects opposed to the church. Tanchelm of Flanders. Sects about Cologne. Sects at Perigueux..... 590

Peter of Bruis..... 595

Henry the Cluniacensian..... 597

Universality of the reformatory movement. The Waldenses. Romance treatise on antichrist. Peter Waldus. Lateran council 1170. Spread of the sect. Knowledge of the Bible. *Pauperes Catholici* established by Innocent the Third. Principles of the Waldenses. The Noble Lesson.... 604

Ideas of Joachim among the Franciscans. *Evangelium aeternum*. John Peter de Oliva. The Italian Apostolicals. Segarelli. Dolcino. Heroic fall of the sect. Principles of Dolcino. Difference of Apostolical brethren from the mendicant monks. Dante's comparison of Dolcino with Mohammed. Wilhelmina..... 617

Violent proceedings of the church against the sects. Inquisitions. Crusade against the Albigenses under Innocent the Third. Order of proceeding of the inquisitions at the Lateran council, 1215. The inquisitor Conrad of Marburg. Suppression of the Stedingers..... 639

Real and nominal Index..... 645

Passages from Ancient Authors..... 651

Passages from Scripture..... 651

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHURCH HISTORY.

FIFTH PERIOD. FROM GREGORY THE SEVENTH TO BONIFACE THE EIGHTH. FROM THE YEAR 1073 TO THE YEAR 1294.

SECTION FIRST.

EXTENSION AND LIMITATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Already, in the preceding period, we took notice of the repeated but unsuccessful attempts to convert the Slavonian tribes living within and on the borders of Germany. Such undertakings, which, without respecting the peculiarities of national character, aimed to force upon the necks of these tribes the yoke of a foreign domination, along with that of the hierarchy, would necessarily prove either a total failure or barren of all salutary influences. The people would struggle, of course, against what was thus imposed on them. Of this sort, were the undertakings of the dukes of Poland to bring the Pommeranians, a nation dwelling on their borders, under their dominion and into subjection to the Christian church. The Poles themselves, as we observed in the preceding period, had been but imperfectly converted; and the consequences of this still continued to be observable in the religious condition of that people; — it was the last quarter, therefore, from which to expect any right measures to proceed for effecting the conversion of a pagan nation. Back-Pommerania having been already, a hundred years before, reduced to a condition of dependence on the Poles, Boleslav the Third (Krzivousti) duke of Poland, in the year 1121, succeeded in compelling West Pommerania also, and its regent, duke Wartislav, to acknowledge his supremacy. Eight thousand Pommeranians were removed by him to a district bordering immediately on his own dominions, in order that they might there learn to forget their ancient customs, their love of freedom, and their old religion, and be induced at length to embrace Christianity. But the Polish bishops were neither inclined nor fitted to operate as missionaries in Pommerania. It was much easier, in this period, to find among the monks men who shrunk from no difficulties or dangers, but were prepared to consecrate themselves, with cheerful alacrity, to any enterprise undertaken in the service of the church and for the good

of mankind. The zeal of these good men, however, was not always accompanied with correct views or sound discretion. Often too contracted in their notions to be able to enter into the views and feelings of rude tribes with customs differing widely from their own, they were least of all fitted to introduce Christianity for the first time among a people like the Pommeranians, — a merry, well-conditioned, life-enjoying race, abundantly furnished by nature with every means of comfortable subsistence, so that a poor man or a beggar was not to be seen amongst them. Having had no experience of those feelings which gave birth to monachism, they could not understand that peculiar mode of life. The monks, in their squalid raiment, appeared to them a mean, despicable set of men, roving about in search of a livelihood. Poverty was here regarded as altogether unworthy of the priesthood; for the people were accustomed to see their own priests appear in wealth and splendor. Hence the monks were spurned with scorn and contempt. Such especially was the treatment experienced by a missionary who came to these parts from the distant country of Spain, — the bishop Bernard.[1] Being a native of Spain, he was unfitted already, by national temperament, to act as a missionary among these people of the north, whose very language it must have been difficult for him to understand. Originally an anchoret, he had lived a strictly ascetic life, when, at the instance of pope Paschalis the Second, he took upon himself a bishopric made vacant by the removal of its former occupant.[2] But finding it impossible to gain the love of his community, a portion of whom still continued to adhere to his predecessor, he abandoned the post for the purpose of avoiding disputes, to which his fondness for peace and quiet was most strongly repugnant, choosing rather to avail himself of his episcopal dignity to go and found a new church among the Pommeranians. Accompanied by his chaplain, he repaired to that country: but with a bent of mind so strongly given to asceticism, he wanted the necessary prudence for such an undertaking. He went about barefoot, clad in the garments he was used to wear as an anchoret. He imagined that, in order to do the work of a missionary in the sense of Christ, and according to the example of the apostles, he must strictly follow the directions which Christ gave to *them*, Matth. 10: 9, 10, without con-

[1] This fact is not stated, it is true, in the most trustworthy account we have of this mission, which is contained in the work of an unknown contemporary writer of the life of bishop Otto of Bamberg, published by Canisius in his Lectiones antiquæ, t. iii, p. ii; but it is reported by the Bambergian abbot Andreas, who wrote in the second half of the fifteenth century. The latter, however, in giving this account, appeals to the testimony of Ulric, a priest in immediate attendance on bishop Otto himself: and what we have said with regard to the missionary efforts of the monks generally is confirmed, at least, by the more certain authority of the anonymous writer just mentioned. Speaking of bishop Otto, he says: "Quia terram Pommeranorum opulentam audiverat et egenos sive mendicos penitus non habere, sed vehementer aspernari, et jamdudum quosdam servos Dei praedicatores egenos propter inopiam contemsisse, quasi non pro salute hominum, sed pro sua necessitate relevanda, officio insisterent praedicandi."

[2] It was at the time of the schism which grew out of the quarrel betwixt the emperor Henry the Fourth and pope Gregory the Seventh; in which dispute, this deposed bishop may, perhaps, have taken an active part as an opponent of the papal system.

sidering that Christ gave his directions in this particular form, with reference to a particular and transient period of time and a peculiar condition of things, entirely different from the circumstances of his own field of labor; and so, for the reasons we have alluded to, he very soon began to be regarded by the Pommeranians with contempt. They refrained, however, from doing him the least injury; till, prompted by a fanatical longing after martyrdom, he destroyed a sacred image in Julin, a town situated on the island of Wollin, — a deed which, as it neither contributed to remove idolatry from the hearts of men, nor to implant the true faith in its stead, could only serve, without answering a single good purpose, to irritate the minds of the people. The Pommeranians would no longer suffer him, it is true, to remain amongst them; but whether it was that they were a people less addicted to religious fanaticism than other pagan nations within our knowledge, and Bernard's appearance served rather to move their pity than to excite their hatred and stir them up to persecution; or whether it was that they dreaded the vengeance of duke Boleslav; the fact was, they still abstained from all violence to his person, but contented themselves with putting him on board a ship and sending him out of their country.

Thus, by his own imprudent conduct, bishop Bernard defeated the object of his enterprise; still, however, he contributed indirectly to the founding of a permanent mission in this country; and the experience which he had gone through would, moreover, serve as a profitable lesson to the man who might come after him. He betook himself to Bamberg, where the severe austerity of his life, as well as his accurate knowledge of the ecclesiastical reckoning of time, would doubtless give him a high place in the estimation of the clergy. And here he found in bishop Otto a man that took a deep interest in pious enterprises, and one also peculiarly well fitted, and prepared by many of the previous circumstances of his life, for just such a mission.

Otto was descended from a noble, but as it would seem not wealthy Suabian family. He received a learned education, according to the fashion of those times; but, being a younger son, he could not obtain the requisite means for prosecuting his scientific studies to the extent he desired, and especially for visiting the then flourishing University of Paris; but was obliged to expend all his energies, in the early part of his life, in gaining a livelihood. As Poland, at this time, stood greatly in need of an educated clergy, and he hoped that he should be able to turn his knowledge to the best account in a country that still remained so far behind others in Christian culture, he directed his steps to that quarter with the intention of setting up a school there. In this employment, he soon rose to consideration and influence; and the more readily, inasmuch as there were very few at that time in Poland, who were capable of teaching all the branches reckoned in this period as belonging to a scholastic education. Children were put under his care from many distinguished families, and in this way he came into contact with the principal men of the land. His knowledge and his gifts were frequently called into requisition by them for va

rious other purposes. Thus he became known to the duke Wladislav Hermann, who invited him to his court, and made him his chaplain.[1] When that duke, after having lost his first wife, Judith, began to think of contracting a second marriage, his attention was directed by means of Otto, to Sophia, sister of the emperor Henry the Fourth: and Otto was one of the commissioners sent, in the year 1088, to the emperor's court, to demand the hand of the princess. The mission was successful and the marriage took place. Otto was one of the persons who accompanied the princess to Poland; and he thus rose to higher consideration at the Polish court. He was frequently sent on embassies to Germany, and in this way he became better known to the emperor, Henry the Fourth. That monarch finally drew him to his own court, where he made him one of his chaplains, and employed him as his secretary. Otto got into great favor with the emperor.[2] He appointed him his chancellor, and when the bishopric of Bamberg, in the year 1102, fell vacant, placed him over that diocese. Now it would be very natural to expect that a favorite of the emperor Henry the Fourth, who had obtained through his influence an important bishopric, would therefore be inclined, in the contests between that monarch and pope Gregory the Seventh, to espouse the interests of the imperial party. But Otto was a man too strict and conscientious in his religion to allow himself to be governed in ecclesiastical matters by such considerations. Like the majority of the more seriously disposed clergy, he was inclined to favor the principles of the Gregorian church government. His love of peace and his prudent management enabled him, however, for a while, to preserve a good understanding with both the emperor and the pope; though at a later period, he allowed himself to become so entangled in the hierarchical interest as to be betrayed into ingratitude and disloyalty towards his prince and old benefactor.[3]

As a bishop, Otto was distinguished for the zeal and interest which he took in promoting the religious instruction of the people in their own spoken language, and for his gift of clear and intelligible preaching.[4]

[1] We follow here the more trustworthy account of the anonymous contemporary. The case is stated differently by the abbot Andreas. According to the latter, Otto made his first visit to Poland in company with the sister of the emperor Henry the Fourth. He calls her Judith, and says that Otto was her chaplain. After her death, according to the same writer, Otto was taken into the service of a certain abbess, at Regensburg, where the emperor became better acquainted with him and took him into his employment. But Andreas himself confirms the statement of the facts by the anonymous writer, when, after speaking of Otto's appointment to be court-chaplain, he adds: "Nobiles quique et potentes illius terrae certatim ei filios suos ad erudiendum offerebant." Accordingly, the account given by this writer also presupposes that Otto had been master of a school in Poland; and how he came to be so is best explained by the statement of the matter in the anonymous writer, only the latter author has fallen into a wrong arrangement of dates.

[2] Because, as the story went, he was careful to have the psalter always ready for the emperor, who was a great admirer of the Psalms; because he had an extraordinary facility of repeating psalms from memory; and, more than all, because he once presented the emperor with his own cast-off psalter, having first caused it to be repaired and set off with a very gorgeous binding.

[3] See farther on,— under the history of the church constitution.

[4] The anonymous biographer says: "Huic ab omnibus sui temporis pontifici-

He was accustomed to moderate, with the severity of a monk, his bodily wants; and by this course, as well as by his frugality generally, was able to save so much the more out of the ample revenues of his bishropric for carrying forward the great enterprises which he undertook in the service of the church and of religion. He loved to take from himself to give to the poor; and all the presents he received from princes and noblemen, far and near, he devoted to the same object. Once, during the season of Lent, when fish were very dear, a large one, of great price, was placed on the table before him. Turning to his steward, said he, "God forbid that I, the poor unworthy Otto, should alone swallow, to-day, such a sum of money. Take this costly fish to my Christ, who should be dearer to me than I am to myself. Take it away to him, wherever thou canst find one lying on the sick-bed. For me, a healthy man, my bread is enough." A valuable fur was once sent to him as a present, with the request that he would wear it in remembrance of the giver. "Yes," said he, alluding to the well-known words of our Lord, "I will preserve the precious gift so carefully, that neither moths shall corrupt nor thieves break in and steal it," — so saying, he gave the fur to a poor lame man, then suffering also under various other troubles.[1] He distinguished himself by the active solicitude, shrinking from no sacrifice, with which he exerted himself to relieve the sufferings of the needy and distressed, during a great famine, which swept off large numbers of the people. He kept by him an exact list of all the sick in the city where he lived, accompanied with a record of their several complaints, and of the other circumstances of their condition, so as to be able to provide suitably for the wants and necessities of each individual.[2] He caused many churches, and other edifices, to be constructed for the embellishment, or the greater security, of his diocese. He especially took pleasure in founding new monasteries; for in common with many of the more seriously disposed in his times, he cherished a strong predilection for the monastic life.[3] Governed by the mistaken notion, so common among his contemporaries, that a peculiar sanctity attached itself to the monastic profession, he expressed a wish, when attacked by an illness that threatened to prove fatal, to die in the monkish habit; and, on his recovery, intended actually to fulfil the monkish vow which he had already made in his heart. It was only through the influence of his friends, who represented to him the great importance of his continuing to labor for the good of the church, that he was deterred from executing this purpose.

Such was the man, whom bishop Bernard, on his return from Pommerania, sought to inflame with a desire of prosecuting the mission

bus in docendo populum naturali sermone principatus minime negabatur; quia disertus et naturali pollens eloquio, usu et frequentia in dicendo facilis erat, quid loco, quid tempori, quid personis competeret observans."

[1] See Lect. antiq. l. c. fol. 90.

[2] The unknown writer says: "Habebat cognitos et ex nominibus propriis notatos omnes paralyticos, languidos, cancerosos, sive leprosos de civitate sua, modum, tempus, et quantitatem languoris eorum per se investigans congruaque subsidia omnibus providebat et per procuratores."

[3] For his views concerning the relation of monasteries to the world, see farther on.

which he himself had unsuccessfully begun: and he drew arguments from his own experience to convince him that he might confidently hope, if he appeared among the Pommeranians with pomp and splendor, and employed his ample means in the service of the mission, to see his labors crowned very soon with the happiest results. Otto's pious zeal could easily be enkindled in favor of such an object. At this juncture, moreover, came a letter from duke Boleslav of Poland, inviting him in the most urgent terms to engage in the enterprise; whether it was that the duke had been informed how Otto had been led, through Bernard's influence, to entertain the idea of such a mission among the Pommeranians, and now wrote him in hopes of bringing him to a decision, — or that this prince, a son of Wladislav by his first marriage, remembering the impression that Otto had made on him when he knew him at the court of his father, felt satisfied that he was the very man to be employed among such a people. The duke earnestly besought him to come to Pommerania; he reminded him of their former connection whilst he himself was yet a youth, at the court of his father.[1] He complained that, with all the pains he had taken, for three years, he had been unable to find a person suited for this work among his own bishops and clergy.[2] He promised that he would defray all the expenses of the undertaking, provide him with an escort, with interpreters, and assistant priests, and whatever else might be necessary for the accomplishment of the object.

Having obtained the blessing of pope Honorius the Second on this work, Otto began his journey on the 24th of April, 1124. Fondly attached as he was to monkish ways, the experience of his predecessor in this missionary field taught him to avoid every appearance of that sort, and rather to present himself in the full splendor of his episcopal dignity. He not only provided himself in the most ample manner with everything that was required for his own support and that of his attendants in Pommerania, but also took with him costly raiment and other articles to be used as presents to the chiefs of the people; likewise, all the necessary church utensils by which he could make it visibly manifest to the Pommeranians that he did not visit them from interested motives, but was ready to devote his own property to the object of imparting to them a blessing which he regarded as the very highest.

Travelling through a part of Bohemia and Silesia, he made a visit to duke Boleslav in Poland. In the city of Gnesen, he met with a kind and honorable reception from that prince. The duke gave him a great number of wagons for conveying the means of subsistence which he took along with him, as well as the rest of the baggage; a sum of money of the currency of the country to defray a part of the expenses; people who spoke German and Slavic to act as his servants; three of his own chaplains to assist him in his labors; and, finally, in the capa-

[1] "Quia in diebus juventutis tuae apud patrem meum decentissima te honestate conversatum memini."

[2] "Ecce per triennium laboro, quod nullum episcoporum vel sacerdotum idoneorum mihive affinium ad hoc opus inducere queo."

city of a protector, the commandant Paulitzky (Paulicius), a man ardently devoted to the cause. This commandant, or colonel, knew how to deal with the rude people; and he was instructed to employ the authority of the duke for the purpose of disposing the Pommeranians to a readier reception of Christianity. Having traversed the vast forest which at that time separated Poland from Pommerania, they came to the banks of the river Netze, which divided the two districts.[1] Here duke Wartislav, who had been apprized of their arrival, came to meet them with a train of five hundred armed men. The duke pitched his camp on the farther side of the river, and then with a few attendants crossed over to the bishop. The latter first had a private interview with the duke and the Polish colonel. As Otto did not possess a ready command of the Slavic language, though he had learned it in his youth, — the colonel served as his interpreter. They conferred with each other about the course to be observed in the conduct of the mission. Meantime, the ecclesiastics remained alone with the Pommeranian soldiers; and probably their courage was hardly equal to the undertaking before them. The way through the dismal forest had already somewhat intimidated them; added to which was now the unusual sight of these rude soldiers, clad and equipped after the manner of their country, with whom they were left alone, in a wild uninhabited region, amid the frightful gloom of approaching night. The alarm which they betrayed, provoked the Pommeranians, who though they had been baptized were perhaps Christians but in name, to work still farther on their fears. Pretending to be pagans, they pointed their swords at them, threatened to stab them, to flay them alive, to bury them to their shoulders in the earth, and then deprive them of their tonsure. But they were soon relieved from their great terror by the reappearance of their bishop in company with the duke, whom, by timely presents, he had wrought to a still more friendly disposition. The example of the duke, who accosted the ecclesiastics in a courteous and friendly manner, was followed by his attendants. They now confessed that they were Christians, and that by their threats they had only intended to put the courage of the ecclesiastics to the test. The duke left behind him servants and guides; he gave the missionaries full liberty to teach and baptize throughout his whole territory, and he commanded that they should be everywhere received in an hospitable manner.

On the next morning, they crossed the borders and directed their steps to the town of Pyritz. They passed through a district which had suffered greatly in the war with Poland, and was but just recovering from the terrors of it. The much-troubled people were the more inclined therefore to yield in all things to the authority of the bishop, who was enabled in passing to administer baptism to thirty in this sparsely-peopled region.

It was eleven of the clock at night when they arrived at Pyritz.

[1] According to the statement of Andreas, the frontier castle where they put up was Uzda, at present Uscz.

They found the whole town awake; for it was a great pagan festival, celebrated with feasting, drinking, song, and revelry; and four thousand men from the whole surrounding country were assembled here on this occasion. Under these circumstances, the bishop did not think it proper to enter the town. They pitched their tents at some distance without the walls, and avoided everything that might attract the attention of the intoxicated and excited multitude. They kept as quiet as possible, not venturing even to kindle a fire. On the next morning, Paulitzky, with the other envoys of the two dukes, entered the town, and called a meeting of the most influential citizens. The authority of the two dukes was here employed to induce the people to compliance. They were reminded of the promise which under compulsion they had before given to the Polish duke, that they would become Christians. No delay was allowed for a more full deliberation on the subject; as they were informed that the bishop, who had forsaken all in order to come and help them, and in the most disinterested manner devoted himself to their service, was near at hand. So they yielded; for they supposed their gods had shown themselves unable to help them. When the bishop, with all his wagons and his numerous train, now entered into the town, terror in the first place seized upon all; for they thought it some new hostile attack. But having convinced themselves of the peaceful intentions of the strangers, they received them with more confidence. Seven days were spent by the bishop in giving instruction; three days were appointed for spiritual and bodily preparation to receive the ordinance of baptism. They held a fast and bathed themselves, that they might with cleanliness and decency submit to the holy transaction. Large vessels filled with water were sunk in the ground and surrounded with curtains. Behind these baptism was administered, in the form customary at that period, by immersion. During their twenty days' residence in this town, seven thousand were baptized; and the persons baptized were instructed on the matters contained in the confession of faith and respecting the most important acts of worship. Before taking his leave of them, the bishop, with the aid of an interpreter, addressed a discourse to the newly baptized from an elevated spot. He reminded them of the vow of fidelity, which they had made to God at baptism; he warned them against relapsing into idolatry; he explained to them that the Christian life is a continual warfare, and then expounded to them the doctrine of the seven sacraments, since by these were designated the gifts of the Holy Ghost which were the appointed means of upholding and strengthening the faithful in this warfare. When he spoke of the sacrament of marriage, he explained that those who had hitherto possessed several wives, ought from that time to retain but *one* as the lawful wife. He testified his abhorrence of the unnatural custom, which prevailed among the women, of destroying at their birth children of the female sex, when their number appeared too large. As it is evident, however, from the whole history of the affair, that the reception of Christianity was in this case brought about chiefly through the fear of the duke of Poland, — a vast number had submitted

to baptism within a very short time, a time altogether insufficient to afford opportunity for communicating the needful instruction to such a multitude, — so it was impossible that what was here done should as yet be attended with any deep-working or permanent effects.

From this place they proceeded to the town of Kammin. Here resided that wife of duke Wartislav whom he distinguished above all the rest, and whom he regarded as his legitimate consort. She was more devoted to Christianity than she ventured to confess in the midst of a pagan population. Encouraged by what she had heard about the labors of Otto in Pyritz, she declared herself already, before his arrival, more openly and decidedly a friend of Christianity. The bishop, therefore, found the popular mind in a favorable state of preparation; many were anxiously awaiting the arrival of the ecclesiastics, from whom they desired to receive baptism. During the forty days which they spent in this place, their strength was hardly sufficient to administer baptism to as many as demanded it. Meantime, duke Wartislav also arrived at Kammin. He expressed great love for the bishop, and greater zeal in favor of Christianity than he had done before. In obedience to the Christian law of marriage, he took an oath, before the bishop and the assembled people, to remain true to his lawful wife alone, and to dismiss four and twenty others whom he had kept as concubines. This act of the prince had a salutary influence on the rest of the people, who followed his example. Here Otto founded the first church for the Pommeranians, over which he appointed one of his clergy as priest, and left him behind for the instruction of the people. A remarkable concurrence of circumstances on one occasion produced a great impression both on the pagans and the new converts. A woman of property, zealously devoted to the old pagan religion, stood forth as a violent opponent of the Christians. She held that the prosperity of the country and its people furnished evidence enough of the power of their ancient deities. On Sunday, when all rested from their labors and repaired to church, this woman required her people, in defiance of the strange god, to work at gathering in the harvest; and, to set the example, went herself into the field and grasped the sickle; but, at the first stroke, she wounded herself with the instrument. This occurrence was looked upon as a manifest judgment of God, — evidence of the power of the God of the Christians.

After having resided here in this manner forty days, the bishop determined to push his missionary journey still onwards; and two citizens of Pyritz, Domislav, father and son, accompanied him as guides. They directed their steps to one of the principal places of the country, the island of Wollin; but here, on account of the warlike, spiteful character of the inhabitants, a people strongly attached to their ancient customs, they had reason to expect more determined opposition. The two guides, as they approached the city of Julin, were struck with fear: and the ecclesiastics, as we have seen, were far from being stouthearted men. But bishop Otto himself, amidst such companions, could not catch the contagion of fear. There was

nothing to disturb him in the threatening prospect of death. Inclined to err at the opposite extreme, earnestly longing to give up his life in his Saviour's cause, he held danger too much in contempt. It required more self-denial, — more self-control on his part, not to throw himself into the midst of the pagan populace, but to try to avert, by wise and prudent measures, the threatening storm. What Otto had done in Pyritz, must have been already known in the city; and the zealous devotees to the old Slavic religion could, therefore, only look upon him as an enemy of their gods. From the fury of the pagan populace, the rude masses of a seafaring people, the worst was to be apprehended. The guides advised that they should remain awhile concealed on the banks of the river, and endeavor to enter the town unperceived by night. In this town, as in the other cities, there was a castle belonging to the duke, attached to which was a strongly-built inclosure, serving as a place of refuge for such as might repair to it. To this place it was proposed that they should remove, with all their goods. Thus would they be protected against the first attacks of the infuriate multitude; and waiting in their place of security until the fury of the people had time to cool, might then come to terms with them. The plan seemed a wise one, and was adopted. But perhaps the peculiar character of the people had not been sufficiently weighed. This plan of stealthily creeping in by night, which betrayed timidity and a want of confidence, might easily lead to serious mischiefs. Whereas, had they come forward openly, they might reckon on the effect which the bishop, appearing in all the pomp of his office, would be likely to produce, on the respect of the people for the authority of the Polish duke, and on the gradually-increasing influence of a secret Christian party: for there was always to be found in this important seaport and commercial mart, a respectable number of Christian merchants from abroad; by intercourse with whom, as well as with such Christian nations as they visited for the purpose of trade, some few had already, as it seems, been gained over to Christianity.

On the following morning, as soon as they were observed by the people, stormy movements began. Even the asylum was not respected. A furious attack of the populace compelled them to abandon it. The Polish colonel addressed the people, but his words had no effect on the excited multitude. Surrounded by his trembling companions Otto, undaunted, cheerful, and ready for martyrdom, walked through an angry crowd, that threatened death to him in particular; and he received several blows. Knocked down in the press, amid the jostling on all sides, he fell into the mire. Paulitzky, a man of courage and great physical strength, covered him with his own body, and, warding off the blows aimed at his life, helped him to regain his feet. Thus they finally made out to escape unharmed from the city; but, instead of immediately abandoning this part of the country, they waited five days longer for the people to come to their senses. The secret Christians in the mean time paid a visit to the bishop. The more respectable citizens also waited on him to apologize for what had happened, which they said they could not hinder; laying all the blame on the populace.

Otto required them to become Christians. Taking advantage of these events to work upon their fears, he threatened them with the vengeance of the Polish duke, whose anger they had good reason to dread, after having offered such an insult to his messengers. He informed them that the only step by which they could hope to pacify the duke, and to ward off the danger which threatened them, was to embrace Christianity. After consulting together, they finally declared that they must be governed by the course taken by their capital town, Stettin; and to this place they advised the bishop to repair first. This advice he followed.

At Stettin, the reception he met with was at first unfavorable. When he proposed to the chief men of the city, that they should put away their old religion and adopt Christianity, they repelled the proposition very decidedly. The life and manners of the nations that professed Christianity had brought it here, as often happens, into discredit. The Pommeranians were now at precisely that point of culture which the apostle Paul, in the seventh of the Epistle to the Romans, describes as a life without the law. Possessing the simplicity, openness, and innocence of primitive manners, and enjoying a degree of temporal prosperity which was the natural result of a favorable climate,[1] soil, and location, they were as yet ignorant of the conflicts between law and lust, and of the strifes of contrary interests, and hence exempt from the evils that grow out of them, as well as unconscious of many wants difficult to be satisfied, but very sure to be called forth in a people making the transition from a state of nature to civilization. Fraud and theft were crimes unknown among them; nothing was kept under lock and key.[2] The hospitality which usually distinguishes a people at this stage of culture, existed among them to an eminent degree. Every head of a family had a room especially consecrated to the reception of guests, in which was kept a table constantly spread for their entertainment. Thus the evils were here absent, by which man is made conscious of the sin lurking in his nature, and thereby brought to feel his need of redemption. If physical well-being were man's highest end, they had the best reason for rejecting that which would tear them away from this happy state of nature. Now, when from this point of view they compared their own condition with that of the Christian nations of Germany, and made up their judgment from the facts which were first presented to them, as they could see nothing to envy in the condition of the latter, so they saw nothing in the religion to which they attributed this condition that could recommend it to their acceptance. Amongst the Christians — said the more respectable citizens of Stettin — are to be found thieves and pirates. Some people have to lose their feet, others their eyes;

[1] The unknown author of the Life of Otto, after mentioning the plenty of game, the numerous herds of cattle, the abundance of wheat and of honey, remarks: "Si vitem et oleum et ficum haberet, terram putares esse repromissionis propter copiam fructiferorum."

[2] Tanta fides et societas est inter eos, ut furtorum et fraudum penitus inexperti, cistas aut scrinia non habeant serata. Nam seram vel clavem ibi non viderunt, sed ipsi admodum mirati sunt, quod clitellas et scrinia episcopi serata viderunt."

every species of crime and of punishment abounds amongst them; Christian abhors Christian: far from us be such a religion. Still, Otto with his companions tarried more than two months in Stettin, patiently expecting some change in their determination. As this, however, did not take place, it was concluded to send a message to duke Boleslav of Poland, with a detailed report of the ill success attending the mission. The citizens of Stettin, when they heard of this, were alarmed. They now declared that it was their intention to send with these delegates an embassy of their own to Poland, and, in case they could obtain a solid and permanent peace, together with a diminution of tribute, they were willing on such conditions to embrace Christianity.

In the mean time, bishop Otto was not idle. On the market-days, which occurred twice a week, when numbers of country people came into the town, he appeared in public, dressed in his episcopal robes, with the crosier borne before him, and harangued the assembled multitude on the doctrines of the Christian faith. The pomp in which he appeared, and curiosity to hear what he had to say, drew many around him; but the faith gained no admittance. He strove first of all, by his own example, the example of a life actuated by the spirit of Christian love, to do away the impression which the citizens of Stettin had received of the Christian faith from looking at the life of the great mass of Christians; to make it by this means practically evident to them, that there was a still higher principle of life than any which man knows while living in a state of nature, however felicitous in other respects. With his own money he redeemed many captives, and, having provided them with clothes and the means of subsistence, sent them home to their friends. One event, however, contributed in an especial manner to make the pious, benevolent life of the bishop generally known, and to attract towards him the minds of the youth.

Many secret Christians were living even in this part of Pommerania, and among the number of these was a woman belonging to one of the first families in Stettin. Having been carried away captive in her youth from a Christian land, she had married a man of wealth and consideration, by whom she had two sons. Although remaining true to her faith, yet she did not venture, in the midst of a pagan people, to appear openly as a Christian. None the less sincere on that account was her joy, when bishop Otto came to the city where she lived: these feelings, however, she dared not express aloud; nor to go over to him before the face of the world. Perhaps it was not without the exertion of some influence on her part, that her two sons were led to pay frequent visits to the clergy, and to make inquiries of them respecting the Christian faith. The bishop did not fail to make the most of this opportunity, by instructing them step by step in all the leading doctrines of Christianity. He found the young men had susceptible minds. They declared themselves convinced, and requested that they might be prepared for baptism. This was done; and the bishop agreed upon a day with them, when they should return and receive baptism. They were baptized, with all the accustomed cere-

monial of the church, without any knowledge of the transaction on the part of their parents. After this, they remained eight days in the bishop's house, in order to observe, with due solemnity, their octave as neophytes. Their mother, in the mean while, got notice of what had been done before the whole time of the octave had expired. Full of joy, she sent a message to the bishop, requesting to see her sons. He received her, seated in the open air, on a bank of turf, surrounded by his clergy, the young men at his feet, clothed in their white robes. The latter, on beholding their mother at a distance, started up, and bowing to the bishop, as if to ask his permission, hastened to meet her. At the sight of her sons in their white robes of baptism, the mother, who had kept her Christianity concealed for so many years, overcome by her feelings, sunk weeping to the ground. The bishop and his clergy hurried to her in alarm, — raising the woman from the earth, they strove to quiet her mind, supposing she had fainted from the violence of her grief. But as soon as she could command herself, and find language to express her feelings, they were undeceived. "I praise thee," — were her first words, — "Lord Jesus Christ, thou source of all hope and of all consolation, that I behold my sons initiated into thy sacraments, enlightened by the faith in thy divine truth." Then kissing and embracing her sons, she added: "For thou knowest, my Lord Jesus Christ, that for many years I have not ceased, in the secret recesses of my heart, to recommend these youths to thy compassion, beseeching thee to do in them, that which thou now hast done." Next, turning to the bishop, she thus addressed him: "Blessed be the day of your coming to this city; for, if you will but persevere, a great church shall here be gathered to the Lord. Do not allow yourselves to grow impatient by any delay. Behold! I, myself, who stand here before you, do, by the aid of Almighty God, encouraged by your presence, reverend father, but also throwing myself on the help of these my children, confess that I am a Christian, a truth which till now I dared not openly acknowledge." She then proceeded to relate her whole story. The bishop thanked God for the wonderful leadings of his grace; he assured the woman of his hearty sympathy, said many things to strengthen and encourage her in the faith, and presented her with a costly robe of fur. At the expiration of the eight days, when the newly-baptized laid aside their white robes, he made them a valuable present of fine raiment, and, having given them the Holy Supper, dismissed them to go home.

This remarkable occurrence was immediately attended with many important consequences. That Christian woman, who had hitherto kept her religion a secret, now that she had taken the first step and gathered courage, freely and openly avowed her faith, and became herself a preacher of the gospel. Through her influence, her domestics, also her neighbors and friends, and her entire family, were induced to receive baptism. The two young men became preachers to the youth. First, they spoke of the bishop's disinterested love, ever active in promoting the good of mankind; then of the new, comforting, bliss-conferring truths which they had heard from his lips. The youth flocked

to the bishop; many were instructed and baptized by him. The young became teachers of the old; and numbers every day presented themselves openly for baptism. But when the father of the two young men who were first baptized came to be informed that his whole family had become Christians, he was exceedingly troubled and indignant at hearing it. The prudent wife, finding that he was returning home in this state of feeling, despatched some of his kinsmen and friends to meet him with comforting and soothing words, while she herself prayed incessantly for his conversion. And when he got home, and saw so many of his fellow-citizens and neighbors already living as Christians, his opposition gradually gave way, till finally he consented to be baptized himself.

When thus, by influences purely spiritual, the way had been prepared for the triumph of Christianity and the downfall of paganism in Stettin, the messengers sent to the Polish duke came back, announcing that they had accomplished the object of their mission. The duke, in the very beginning of his letter, proclaimed himself an enemy to all pagans; at the same time he assured them that, if they would abide faithfully by their promise, and embrace Christianity, they might look for peace and amity on a solid foundation; otherwise, they must expect to see their territory laid waste by fire and sword, and to experience his eternal enmity. He first reproached them for the rude behavior which they had shown at the preaching of the gospel; but declared that, notwithstanding all this, yielding to the earnest desires of the ambassador, and especially of bishop Otto, he was determined to forgive them, and to grant them peace on more favorable terms than ever, provided that henceforth they would faithfully observe the conditions they had themselves proposed, and show docility to their religious teachers. The favorable impression produced by this reply was improved to the utmost by the bishop. He proposed at once to the assembled people that, inasmuch as the worship of the true God was incapable of being united with the worship of idols, in order to prepare a dwelling henceforth for the living God, all the monuments of idolatry should be destroyed. But as they still clung to their belief in the reality and power of these gods, and dreaded their vengeance, he with his clergy proposed to go forward and set them the example. Signing themselves with the cross, the true preservative from all evil, and armed with hatchets and pickaxes, they would proceed to demolish all those monuments of idolatry; and if they remained unharmed, it should be a token to all, that they had nothing to fear from the gods, but might safely follow the example he had given them.

This was done. The first monument destroyed was a temple dedicated to the Slavic god Triglav, containing an image of that divinity, and decorated on its inner walls with various works of sculpture and paintings in oil. In this temple were many precious articles; for the tenth part of all the spoils obtained in war was consecrated to this deity, and deposited here. Abundance of costly offerings were here to be found; goblets of horn ornamented with precious stones, golden

bowls, knives, and poniards of beautiful workmanship. All these articles it was proposed to give to the bishop; but he declined receiving them. "God forbid," said he, "that we should think of enriching ourselves out of what belongs to you. Such things as these, and still more beautiful, we have already at home." Then, after having sprinkled them with holy water and signed them with the cross, he caused them to be distributed among the people. With this proof of a disinterested love, that avoided the very appearance of selfishness, bishop Otto manifested also a singular liberality of Christian spirit, in refusing to give up to destruction that which, innocent in itself, might be devoted to better uses for the benefit of mankind. The only gift he consented to receive was the image of Triglav; of which, causing the rest of the body to be destroyed, he preserved the triple head as a trophy of the victory obtained over idolatry. This he afterwards sent to Rome, in evidence of what he had done as a missionary of the Roman Church, for the destruction of paganism. Three other buildings were next demolished, temples[1] erected to idols where the people were accustomed to meet for their sports and carousals, as well as for deliberation on more serious matters. In destroying or removing the monuments of the old idolatry, and everything connected with it, Otto did not, with heedless fanaticism, treat all cases alike, but was governed in his mode of procedure by a prudent regard to circumstances. It was an important point to distinguish between those objects which, by constantly furnishing some point of attachment for the old pagan bent, would serve to keep it alive, and others where nothing of this kind was to be feared. In the vicinity of each of those buildings dedicated to the gods was to be found one of those ancient oaks, regarded everywhere in Germany with religious veneration,[2] and beside it a fountain. The citizens besought the bishop that these oaks might be spared. They promised to withhold from them all associations of a religious character. They simply wished to enjoy the pleasant shade and other amenities of these chosen spots; which indeed was no sin, and he complied with their request. Among other objects, however, there was a horse considered sacred, which in times of war was employed for purposes of divination.[3] In demanding the removal of all such objects, Otto was inexorably severe; he would not allow one of them to remain; since he was aware of the influence which these superstitions were still wont to exert even long after the destruction of paganism. He insisted, therefore, that the sacred horse should be sent into another country and sold. Notwithstanding these decided measures for the extirpation of paganism, not a man had the boldness to stand forth in its defence, except the priest whose business it was to tend and manage the sacred horse. But the sudden death of this man, who had stood up alone for the honor of the gods,

[1] Concinæ. [2] See vol. iii, p. 51.

[3] Nine javelins were placed in a row, an ell apart. The horse was then led over them, and if he passed without touching one of them, this was considered a favorable omen. Horses were held sacred also amongst the ancient Germans, especially for the purpose of prophecy. Vid. Tacit. Germania c. x; Grimm's Deutsche Mythologie, s. 378, u. d. f.

was favorably construed as a divine judgment. After the temples had been destroyed, the people were admitted to baptism; and the same order was observed here as at Pyritz, numbers presenting themselves at a time, and receiving the ordinance, after a discourse had been preached to them on the doctrines of faith. Having tarried here five months in the whole, Otto departed from Stettin, leaving behind him a church with a priest.

From Stettin, he visited a few of the places belonging to the territory of that city.[1] He then went by water, down the Oder, and across the Baltic sea, to Julin. The inhabitants of this town having agreed with the bishop, that they would follow the example of the capital city, had already sent persons to Stettin, for the purpose of obtaining exact information respecting the manner in which the gospel was there received. The news they obtained could not fail to make the most favorable impression; and Otto was received in Julin with demonstrations of joy and respect. The activity of the clergy during the two months which they spent in this place, scarcely sufficed to baptize all who offered themselves. After the Christian church had thus been planted in the two chief cities of Pommerania, the question arose, where should the first bishopric be founded. Otto and duke Wartislav agreed that Julin was the most suitable place to be made the first seat of a bishopric for Pommerania; partly, because this city was so situated as to form a convenient central point, and partly because the rude people here, inclined by nature to be refractory and insolent, and peculiarly exposed to the infection of paganism, especially needed the constant presence and oversight of a bishop.[2] Two churches were here begun. From this place Otto went to a city called Clonoda, or Clodona,[3] where, taking advantage of the abundance of wood, he erected a church;[4] next, he proceeded to a city which had suffered extremely by the ravages attending the war with Poland;[5] and from thence to Colberg. Many of the inhabitants of this place were now absent on voyages of traffic to the coasts of the Baltic sea; and those that remained at home were unwilling to make a decision till a general assembly could be holden of all the people: the bishop, however, finally succeeded in inducing them to receive baptism. The city of Belgard was the extreme point of his missionary tour; it became necessary for him to reserve the extending of the mission to the remaining parts of Pommerania for a future day, as the affairs of his own diocese now called him home. But first, he felt bound to make a visitation-tour to the communities already founded by him, and bestow confirmation on those who had before been baptized. Many whom he had not met with on his first visit, being then absent on voyages of

[1] The unknown author mentions two castles, Graticia and Lubinum, the first Garz, the second Lebbehn, according to the probable conjecture of Kanngiesser. See his Geschichte von Pommern, p. 660.

[2] "Ut gens aspera ex jugi doctoris praesentia mansuesceret," says Otto's companion.

[3] According to Kanngiesser's interpretation, *Gollnow*.

[4] "Quia locus nemorosus erat et amoenus et ligna ad aedificandum suppetebant."

[5] Kanngiesser makes it probable, from the name and situation, that this place was *Naugard*.

trade, now presented themselves for baptism. The churches, whose foundations he had laid during his first residence in these districts, had in the mean time been completed, and he was enabled to consecrate them. The Christian Pommeranians now besought him, the beloved founder of their churches, to remain with them himself and be their bishop; but he could not consent. Having spent a year lacking five weeks in Pommerania, he hastened back, that he might be with his flock at the celebration of Palm-Sunday. He directed his course once more through Poland, where he met duke Boleslav, and reported to him the successful issue of his enterprise. As Otto could not hold the first bishopric himself, Boleslav nominated to this post Adalbert, one of his chaplains, who by his direction had accompanied bishop Otto as an assistant. Otto himself left several priests in Pommerania to prosecute the work which had been commenced: but they were too few in number to complete the establishment of the Christian church; nor was it likely that any of them would possess the ardor and courage of their leader. As the time he was able to pass in the several places was comparatively so short; as he was obliged to employ an interpreter in his intercourse with the people; as political motives had coöperated, at least in the case of many, to procure their conversion, so it may readily be conceived that this conversion of great masses was very far from being a permanent and thorough work.

The Christian worship of God having now been introduced into one half of Pommerania, whilst paganism reigned in the other, the necessary result was that a striking contrast presented itself between the two portions; and the example of ancient customs, of the popular festivals of paganism, its amusements and its carousals, among the pagans might easily entice back the others again into their former habits. They would yearn after their old unconstrained, national mode of life. The restrictions under which Christianity and the church, with its laws concerning fastings, laid their untutored nature, might be felt by them as an intolerable yoke, which they longed to exchange for the enjoyment of their ancient freedom; and thus it might happen that, in the districts where Otto had laid the foundation of the Christian church, the pagan party would again lift up its head, and paganism begin once more to extend its empire. Such fluctuations in the conflict between Christianity and paganism — as in the early history of Christianity, which, having made rapid progress at first, immediately encountered a strong reaction of paganism — are often found recurring in the history of missions. We may mention, as an example furnished by the modern history of missions, the mission among the Society Islands of Australia.

Gladly would Otto have gone earlier to the help of the new church in its distress; but various public misfortunes, and the political affairs in which he became involved as an estate of the German empire, prevented him, for full three years, from fulfilling his wish. It was not till the spring of the year 1128, that he could visit the field in person. But to avoid laying any farther burden on the dukes of Poland and

Bohemia, he now chose another route, which had been made practicable by the subjugation of the Slavic populations in those districts. He directed his journey through Saxony, Priegnitz, and the territories which were reckoned as belonging to Leuticia, to the adjacent parts of Pommerania. He determined also, in this second mission, to defray all his personal expenses and those of his attendants out of his own purse, and to take with him a large number of valuable presents. To this end he purchased, in Halle, a quantity of grain and other merchandise, intended for presents, all of which he placed on board vessels, to be conveyed by the Saale to the Elbe and Havel, after which the lading was conveyed onward by fifty wagons. He arrived first at a part of Pommerania where the gospel had not yet been preached, and entering the city of Demmin, found but one old acquaintance, in the person of the governor. Here, on the next day, he met his old friend, duke Wartislav. The duke was on his return, laden with spoils, from a successful war with the neighboring Leuticians. Many sights were here presented to the eyes of Otto, which could not fail to make a very painful impression on his benevolent heart. The army of the duke had brought away a number of captives; these were to be divided in common with the rest of the booty. Among them were to be found many persons of weak and delicate constitutions. Husbands were to be separated from their wives, wives from their husbands, parents from their sons. The bishop interceded with the duke in their behalf, and persuaded him to liberate the weakest, and not to separate near kinsmen and relatives from each other. But, not satisfied with this, he paid from his own funds the ransom-money for many who were still pagans. These he instructed in Christianity, baptized, and then sent back to their homes. Otto and the duke showed every kindness to each other, and exchanged presents. They agreed that, on Whitsuntide, now close at hand, a diet should be held at Usedom, with a view to induce the several states to consent to, and take an active part in, the establishment of the Christian church. In the letter-missive, it was expressly announced, that the errand of bishop Otto was to preach the Christian religion, and that this was the subject to be brought before the diet. Otto next laded a vessel on the river Peene, with all his goods, which thus after three days arrived at Usedom. He himself, however, with a few attendants, proceeded leisurely along the banks of the Peene to that city, taking advantage of this jaunt to prepare the way, wherever he went, for the preaching of the gospel.

In Usedom, he found there were already some scattered seeds of Christianity, conveyed there by the priests he had left behind him. Still more was done by himself. At this place the deputies of the states, in obedience to the summons of the duke, now came together, composed partly of such as had always remained pagans and partly of those who had been previously converted, but during Otto's absence had relapsed into paganism. The duke presented to them the bishop, — a man whose whole appearance commanded respect. In an impressive discourse, in which he invited them to set their people the

example of embracing the worship of the true God, he bade them remark that the excuse they had always offered would no longer avail them, namely, that the preachers of this religion were a needy, contemptible set of men, in whom no confidence could be placed, and who pursued this business merely to get a living. Here they beheld one of the highest dignitaries of the German empire, who at home possessed every thing in abundance, — gold, silver, precious stones; a man on whom no one could fix a suspicion that he sought anything for himself; who, on the contrary, had relinquished a life of honor and of ease, and applied his own property to the object of communicating to them that treasure which he prized as the highest good. These words had their effect; and the whole assembly declared themselves ready to pursue any course which the bishop might propose to them. The latter now began; and, taking occasion from the festival of Whitsuntide, spoke of the grace and goodness of God, of the forgiveness of sin, and of the communication of the Holy Ghost and his gifts. His words made a profound impression; the apostates professed repentance, and the bishop reconciled them with the church. Those who had always been pagans, suffered themselves to be instructed in Christianity and submitted to baptism. A decree of the diet permitted the free preaching of the gospel in all places. Otto was occupied here a whole week. He then concluded to extend his labors still farther, and asked the advice of the duke. The latter declared that, by virtue of the decree of the diet, the whole country stood open to him. The bishop now commenced sending his clergy, two by two, into all the towns and villages, intending to follow them himself.

But although the decree of the diet possessed the validity of a law, yet such was not the character and spirit of the people that obedience would necessarily follow in all cases. There were important old cities who maintained a certain independence; and in many districts the ancient popular religion had a powerful party in its favor, who were dissatisfied with this decree. Among these cities was the town of Wolgast, a place to which bishop Otto had determined to go first. A priest lived here, who for a year had made it his business to resist the spread of Christianity, to excite against it the hatred of the people, and to enkindle their zeal for the honor of their ancient deities; though he had been unable as yet to procure the passage of a public decree in reference to these matters. But now, when the diet had passed a decree so favorable for the diffusion of Christianity, this priest thought himself bound to make a final effort to carry out by fraud and cunning what he could not accomplish by persuasion. Repairing by night, in his sacerdotal robes, to a neighboring forest, he concealed himself on a hill, in the midst of a thicket of brush-wood. Early the next morning, a peasant passing along the road on his way to the city, heard a voice call out to him from the dark forest, and bid him stop and listen. Already terrified at the voice, he was still more amazed at beholding a figure clothed in white. The priest, following up the impression, represented himself as the highest of the national gods, who had chosen here to make his appearance. He signified his

anger at the reception which the worship of the strange God had met with in the country, and bade the man say to the inhabitants of the city, that the man must not be allowed to live who should attempt to introduce among them the worship of that strange God. When the credulous peasant came to tell his story in the city, the priest who had played this trick, first put on the air of a skeptic, with a view to draw out the peasant into a new and more detailed account of what he had seen and heard, so as to avail himself of the fresh impression of the story. Such was the effect produced by it on the popular mind, that the citizens passed a decree ordaining that if the bishop or any of his associates entered the city, they should instantly be put to death, and that any citizen who harbored them in his house should suffer the like punishment.

These events had transpired, and such was the tone of the popular feeling, when the two missionaries sent before him by the bishop, Ulric and Albin, — the latter of whom, possessing a ready knowledge of the Slavic language, was commonly employed by him as an interpreter, — arrived at Wolgast, without dreaming of the danger to which they exposed themselves. Conformably to the Pommeranian manners, they met with an hospitable reception from the wife of the burgomaster, a woman who, though not a Christian, was distinguished for a reverence quite free from fanaticism towards the unknown God, as well as for her active philanthropy. But when, after being entertained by the woman, they proceeded to explain who they were, and the object of their visit, she was struck with consternation, and informed them of the danger to which they were exposed. Still, she was determined to observe faithfully the laws of hospitality. She pointed the strangers to a place of concealment in an upper part of her house, and caused their baggage to be quickly conveyed to a place of safety, beyond the walls of the city. It is true, the arrival of the strangers whom she entertained soon awakened suspicion among the excited multitude; but as the practice of hospitality to strangers was so common a thing in Pommerania, she found no difficulty in evading the questions of the curious, declaring that strangers were indeed entertained by her, as oftentimes before, but that after taking their repast, they had left her; and as the persons who inquired saw no signs of their being still in the house, they gave up their suspicions.

The account of these movements had already reached Usedom; and the duke, therefore, thought it advisable to accompany the bishop to Wolgast with a large band of followers, among whom were some of the members of the diet, and several armed soldiers. Three days had been spent by the two ecclesiastics in their place of concealment, when by the arrival of so powerful a protector they felt themselves perfectly safe, and at liberty to emerge from their retreat. The bishop, thus sustained, was enabled to commence the preaching of the gospel. But when the authority of the duke had restored quiet in the city, and the pagan party was forced to keep still, a feeling of security took possession of some of the ecclesiastics. They ridiculed the two

priests, when they spoke of their narrow escape. They separated from the bishop and the rest of the company, despising prudence as no better than cowardice. Mingling fearlessly among the people, they attempted to slip into the temple. By this act, however, the fury of the pagans was stirred up afresh; especially as the suspicion got abroad, that they were seeking an opportunity to set fire to the temple. Troops of armed people began to assemble. The priest Ulric, perceiving these signs of an impending tumult, said: "I shall not consent to tempt my God so often," and returning back to the bishop, he was followed by all the others except one ecclesiastic, named Encodric, who had advanced too far, and already had his hand on the door of the temple. The pagans now rushed upon him in a body, intending to make him the victim of their common vengeance against the whole party. Seeing no other place of refuge, urged by the fear of immediate death, he penetrated into the inmost parts of the temple; and this desperate movement is said to have saved him. Suspended in this temple was a shield, wrought with great art and embossed with gold, dedicated to Gerovit, the god of war, which was regarded as inviolably sacred, and supposed to render the person of him who bore it also inviolable. As the ecclesiastic, flying for his life, ran round the temple looking for a weapon of defence or a place of concealment, he descried this shield, and seizing it, sprang into the midst of the furious crowd. Everybody now fled before him. Not a man dared lay hands on him; and thus, running for his life, he got safely back to his companions. The bishop took occasion from this incident to exhort his clergy to greater caution. He continued his labors in this place, until the people had demolished all their temples, and the foundation was laid of a church, over which he set one of his clergy as the priest.

Without being accompanied by the duke, who probably had hastened to his assistance solely on account of the occurrences at Wolgast, Otto proceeded to Gützkow. It agreed alike with his temperament and his principles to accomplish the whole work before him by no other power than that of love, which wins the heart. He never made any use of his political connections except for the purpose of securing himself in the first place against the fury of the pagans. It was certainly most gratifying to him, whenever he found he could dispense with the arm of secular power. Having left the duke free to attend to his own affairs, he felt more at liberty to decline the proposition of his old friend, the Margrave Albert of Bären, afterwards founder of Mark Brandenburg, who, on being informed of the popular movements at Wolgast, offered by his envoys, that met the bishop at Gützkow, to assist him against the obstinate pagans. In Gützkow, Otto would have found easier access to the hearts of the people, had he consented to spare a new and magnificent temple, which, considered as a work of art, was reckoned a great ornament to the city. Magnificent presents were offered to him, if he would yield. Finally, he was entreated to convert this temple into a Christian church, as had been done aforetime; but the bishop, who, not without reason, feared

the consequences which would result from any mixture of Christianity with paganism, believed it inexpedient, indulgent as he was in other respects, to give way in this instance;[1] and by a comparison drawn from the parables of our Lord, he endeavored to make the people understand, that he could not, in consistency with their own good, comply with their wishes. "Would you think," said he to the petitioners, "of sowing grain among thorns and thistles? No, you would first pluck up the weeds, that the seed of the wheat might have room to grow. So I must first remove from the midst of you everything that belongs to the seed of idolatry, those thorns to my preaching, in order that the good seed of the gospel may bring forth fruit in your hearts to the everlasting life." And by such representations, daily repeated, he finally overcame the resistance of these people, so that with their own hands they destroyed the temple and its idols. But on the other hand, to indemnify the people for the loss of their magnificent building, he zealously pushed forward the erection of a stately church; and as soon as the sanctuary with the altar was finished, seized upon this occasion, since he could not remain among them till the entire structure was finished, of appointing a splendid festival for its dedication; one which should outshine all their previous pagan celebrations, and be a true national festival. When nobles and commoners were all assembled at this celebration, and the whole ceremonial of the church, customary on such occasions, had been solemnly observed, he proceeded to explain to the assembled multitude the symbolical meaning of these observances, and, directing their attention from the outward signs to the inner substance, warned them against the delusive supposition that the requisitions of Christianity could be satisfactorily met by mere outward forms. He labored to make it plain to them, that the highest meaning of the consecration of a church had reference to the consecration of God's temple in the soul of every believer, since Christ dwells by faith in the hearts of the faithful. And after having thus interpreted the several observances, he turned to one of the duke's vassals, Mizlav, the governor of this district, who had been a member of the assembly of the states lately holden at Usedom, had then been baptized by him, and, as the sequel shows, made an honest profession of Christianity. For the purpose of bringing out in him the truth which each man was to apply to himself, said he, "Thou art the *true* house of God, my beloved son. Thou shalt, this day, be consecrated and dedicated; consecrated to God, thy Almighty Creator; so that, separated from every foreign master, thou mayest be exclusively his dwelling and his possession. Therefore, my beloved son, do not hinder this consecration. For little avails it to have outwardly consecrated the house thou seest before thee, if a like consecration be not made in thy own soul also." The bishop here paused; or perhaps Mizlav interrupted him.[2] At any rate, Mizlav, who felt these words, of which he well understood the import, enter

[1] See vol. iii, p. 15.

[2] In the Mss. l. c. iii, c. 9, f. 79, Canis. lect. antiq. ed. Basnage, iii, 2, there is to be found in this place a slight deficiency which leaves the meaning uncertain.

like a goad into his soul, demanded;— What then was required on his part in order to such a consecration of God's temple within him? The bishop, plainly perceiving by this question that the man's heart was touched by the Spirit of God, and resolved to profit by so favorable an indication, and to follow up the leadings of the divine prompter, replied :[1] "In part thou hast begun already, my son, to be a house of God. See that thou art *wholly* so. For thou hast already exchanged idolatry for faith by attaining to the grace of baptism. It remains that thou shouldst adorn faith by works of piety." And he required in particular, that he should renounce and abandon all deeds of violence, all rapacity, oppression, fraud, and shedding of blood. He exhorted him to adopt the words of our Lord as his rule, never to do unto others otherwise than he would be done by. And that he might carry out this rule into immediate practice, he called upon him to set at liberty those persons whom he had confined for debt, and who were now pining in prison; or at least such of them as were of the same household of faith. To this Mizlav replied: "What you require of me is extremely hard; for many of those persons are owing me large sums of money." Upon this, the bishop reminded him of the petition in the Lord's prayer, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." Only then would he be certain of receiving the forgiveness of his sins from the Lord, when he felt ready, in the name of the Lord, to release all his debtors. "Well, then," said Mizlav, deeply sighing, "I do here, in the name of the Lord Jesus, give them all their liberty; that so, according to your words, my sins may be forgiven, and the consecration of which you spoke may be perfected in me this day." This act of Mizlav spread joy all around, and an additional interest was thus given to the festival. There was one prisoner, however, of whom Mizlav had said nothing. A nobleman of Denmark, owing him five hundred pounds of gold, had given his son as a security; and this young man, bound in fetters, lay pining in a subterranean cell. A mere accident led to the discovery of him,— the only individual who had not been set free. One of the vessels needed for the consecration of the church was missing; and the ecclesiastics while searching for it in one corner and another, at length came upon the cell where this youth lay confined. He implored them to help him. But as Mizlav had already done so much, the bishop felt unwilling to demand of him this final sacrifice. Still, it distressed him to think that so joyful a festival should be saddened by the sufferings of one unfortunate being. He first resorted to prayer, and fervently besought the Almighty that, to crown the joy of this blessed festival, he would have compassion on the case of this only unhappy individual. Then setting before his clergy how he had already obtained so many self-denying acts from Mizlav that he did not feel at liberty to press him any farther, he proposed that they should speak to him: and after assuring him that the bishop knew how to appreciate the sacrifices he had already made, introduce the subject with

[1] This is what the biographer doubtless intended to denote by the words, "Intelligens adesse Spiritum Sanctum."

all possible gentleness. This was done: and Mizlav finally declared that he was ready to offer this last and most difficult sacrifice. "Nay," said he to the bishop, "I am ready, if required, to give up my person, and all that I call mine, for the name of my Lord Jesus Christ." The example of the principal man of the district had its effect on many others, who strove according to their means, to evince in like manner the genuineness of the change they had experienced.

Subsequent to these events, bishop Otto endeared himself to the Pommeranians, by his exertions to save them from a great public calamity; for it was by his intervention that a military expedition, threatened by duke Boleslav of Poland, who had become irritated by the apostasy of a part of the Pommeranians from Christianity, and by their neglect to fulfil certain articles of an old treaty, was prevented. Soon after, he had a conference with duke Wartislav at Usedom; probably for the purpose of reporting his transactions with the duke of Poland, and also of advising with him about the policy of extending the missionary operations and establishing some new stations. In regard to this matter, however, animated as he certainly was by an ardent zeal for the cause of Christ, he still failed to act with apostolic prudence. For notwithstanding that the work in Pommerania went on at present so prosperously, and everything depended on taking advantage of favorable circumstances; and notwithstanding so much still remained for him to do here, he thought of abandoning the field before he had fully taken possession of it, or provided for its permanent occupation, to go in quest of another which promised less success, and which might easily prove the means of bringing all his earthly labors to a sudden termination. His eye had fixed itself eagerly on the island of Rügen, about a day's journey distant; and an earnest longing beset him to appear amongst the inhabitants of that island, a small warlike tribe zealously devoted to heathenism, and preach to them the gospel. The spread of Christianity among their neighbors the Pommeranians, had roused the animosity of the pagan people on the island of Rügen to a more extravagant pitch; and they threatened death to the bishop if he ventured to approach them. Otto was not to be deterred, however, by such threats, from attempting the expedition; on the contrary, his zeal was inflamed to exhibit the power of faith in overcoming such difficulties, and even to offer up his life for the gospel. In vain did the duke, and his own friends, declare themselves opposed to the scheme; assuring him that he would, by attempting it, sacrifice his life for nothing, — a life he was bound to preserve for labors that promised more success. Otto gave way, in this instance, to the impulse of his feelings instead of listening to the voice of reason. But in his own opinion, he reasoned more correctly than his friends, whom he rebuked for their want of faith. "It is a much greater thing," said he, "to preach by actions than by words. And suppose we were *all* to give up our lives for the faith; yet even our death would not be useless. By so dying we should set our seal to the faith which we preach, and that faith would spread with the greater power." While his friends strove to prevent Otto from cross-

ing over to Rügen, he himself was occupied in devising some way of getting to the island unobserved. It was necessary, therefore, to watch him closely. But whilst the rest of the clergy blamed the rash zeal of their bishop, the priest Ulric felt himself impelled to realize the darling thought of his superior. Having first begged and received his blessing on the undertaking, Ulric went on board a ferry-boat, taking with him such articles as were necessary for the celebration of the mass. But wind and weather were obstinately against him; three several times he was beaten back by the storm; but no sooner did it remit its violence than he again attempted to get over to the island. Thus he struggled with the winds and waves for seven days; many times hovering between life and death. But the weather constantly proving unfavorable, and Ulric's boat getting to be leaky, the bishop at length began to regard these unpropitious events as indications of the divine will, and forbade his beloved priest from making any further attempts. The dangers he had run now became the subject of remark. Said one, "Suppose Ulric had perished, who would have been to blame for it?" Here the priest Adalbert spoke out, plainly criminating the bishop himself. "Would not the blame," said he, "justly fall on him who exposed him to such dangers?" — showing not only his own independent spirit, but also the gentleness of the bishop which would allow one of his clergy to speak so frankly about him in his own presence. Otto, instead of taking the remark unkindly, endeavored to refute the implied charge by arguing that he had done rightly, though on such grounds as he would not have offered except under the influence of his present feelings. Said he, "If Christ sent the apostles as sheep among wolves, was Christ to be blamed if the wolves devoured the sheep?"

That he might, in the shortest time, extend out his labors in all directions, so as to fill up and complete the whole work begun during his first residence in Pommerania, Otto determined to alter his plan; and, instead of keeping all his clergy about him, as at first, and laboring in common with them from a single point, to divide the field between them and himself by sending them to different stations. Some he sent to Demmin; he himself went to Stettin, to combat the paganism which had again lifted up its head there. But his clergy neither entered heartily into his plan nor partook of his courageous faith. They trembled at the fury of the pagan people in that place, and were not willing to expose their lives. The bishop, however, since he could not overcome their opposition by expostulation, resolved to proceed on the journey alone. Having spent a day in solitude and prayer, to prepare himself for the undertaking, he stole away in the evening, as soon as it grew dark, taking with him his mass-book and the sacramental cup. The clergy knew nothing about it, till they sent to call him to matins (the *matutina*). Finding that he was gone, they were struck with shame, and began to grow alarmed for their beloved spiritual father. They hurried away after him, and compelled him to return back. On the next morning, they set out in company with him, and crossed over by ship to Stettin.

In Stettin, Otto's earlier labors had proved by no means fruitless. This appeared evident from the events which followed. A reaction of those Christian convictions which had already been deeply implanted in the minds of many, led, under a variety of peculiar circumstances and favorable coincidences, to a new triumph of Christianity over paganism. Christianity, as it seems, had gained entrance especially among the higher and more cultivated class of the people,[1] and in their case, paganism found, at its revival, but little matter to work upon. The priests, however, who had submitted to baptism were still pagans at heart, and they lost too much by the change of religion to get easily over the pain and vexation which that loss occasioned. They readily found means of operating on the rude masses of the people, in whom, during so short a period, Christianity had not yet struck its roots deep. A pestilence, extending to men and cattle, accompanied with unusual mortality, was interpreted by them as a sign of the anger of the deities, — a thing easily made evident to the people. They managed, such was their influence, to carry the matter so far, that a mob assembled to destroy a Christian church. Yet there were some who had felt the power of Christianity, though they had not entirely loosened their hold of paganism. In this class there was a struggle between the old and the new, or a commingling of both.

Before the time of Otto's second visit to Stettin, there was residing in that town a person of some note, who, after having experienced various remarkable providences in the course of his life, stood forth as a zealous witness for Christianity, thus preparing the way by his influence for a better state of things. Witstack was one of those belonging to the more consequential class of citizens, who had been converted and baptized by Otto; and although Christianity was by no means apprehended by him according to its pure spirit, yet he had within him the germ of a strong and vigorous faith. The image of bishop Otto, the man whom he had seen laboring with such self-denying love, such unshaken confidence in God, this image seems especially to have become deeply stamped on his mind. Since his conversion, he had uniformly refused to take part in any warlike undertaking, except *against pagans*. Fighting against these was one way, as he thought, by which he could show his zeal for Christianity. He joined a piratical expedition, probably against the Rugians; experiencing a defeat, he with others was taken captive and thrown in chains. During his confinement, he resorted for consolation and support to prayer. Once, after long-continued, earnest prayer, falling asleep, he dreamed that bishop Otto appeared to him and promised that he should be assisted; soon after which, by a remarkable turn of providence, he found means of escaping from his confinement.[2] Hasten-

[1] The Sapientiores, as distinguished from the people, — a class frequently alluded to by the unknown writer of Otto's life.

[2] The account by the unknown writer, whom we follow here also, is certainly deserving of credit in its main points. We find, for the most part, in it, that graphical mode of description, which bespeaks an eye-witness, — a simplicity quite remote from the exaggerative style of Andreas, — few miraculous stories, and these, for the most part, of such a character, that the facts

ing to the seashore, he found a boat, leaping on which he committed himself to the waves, and, favored by the wind, in a short time got safely back to Stettin. He looked upon his deliverance as a miracle. It seemed to him a direct testimony to Otto's holiness, — a proof that Christianity was the cause of God. He regarded it as a divine call, inviting him to appear as a witness among his countrymen, for the Being who had miraculously saved him, and to labor for the extension of his worship among them.[1] After his return, he caused the boat to be hung up at the city gates, as a lasting memorial of his deliverance and testimony in favor of the Being to whom he owed it. With great zeal, he bore witness among his countrymen, of the God whom bishop Otto had taught him to pray to, and whose almighty power had been so clearly exhibited in his own case; he announced to the fallen the divine judgments which would surely overtake them, unless they repented and returned back to the faith.

Still another fact, which was likewise regarded as a miracle, had made a favorable impression. In the popular tumult, got up for the purpose of destroying the church which had been erected in that town, it so happened that one of the persons actively engaged in the affair, when about to strike a blow with his hammer, was seized with a sudden palsy; his hand stiffening, let the hammer drop, and he himself fell from the ladder. It seems that he was one of the relapsed Christians. Perhaps a reaction of the faith, not yet by any means wholly extinguished in his soul, once more came over him; hence an inward struggle, a sudden access of fear, which palsied his arm, as he was about to join with the rest in destroying a temple consecrated to the God of the Christians. Paganism, it is true, still maintained a place in his soul; he could not wholly renounce the worship of the ancient gods; but still, the God of the Christians, whose temple was being destroyed, appeared to him as one against whom no human power could prevail; as was manifest in his own case. He therefore advised that, in order to preserve friendship with all the gods, they should erect by the side of this church an altar to the national divinities. Now, even this was something gained; it was a point in advance, that the God of the Christians should be recognized by pagans themselves as a mighty being beside the ancient gods.

Thus, after such preparatory events, Otto's arrival at Stettin fell at the right moment to bring the contest between Christianity and paganism, aroused by the influence of Witstack, to a more open outbreak

at bottom may be easily separated from the mode of apprehending and representing them as miracles, or that they may be easily reduced to a natural connection of events, of the higher sort. But, in this case, the report refers back to the saying of Witstack. In this report, drawn up from recollection long after the events, everything, in the lively feeling of gratitude to God, might receive a coloring of the wonderful. But we are by no means authorized to measure all extraordinary psychological phenomena by the standard of ordinary experience, and the objective fact as it actually occurred ever lies at bottom of the representation.

[1] The historian already mentioned records the following words of Witstack to the bishop, in reference to the boat which was the means of his salvation: "Haec cimba testimonium sanctitatis tuae, firma mentum fidei meae, argumentum legationis meae ad populum istum."

and final decision. However great his danger might seem, when men contemplated from without the rage of the pagan mass of the population, yet it would appear by no means so great to him who could more closely examine, on the very scene of events, the circumstances of the case; for although the pagan party, which was made up, for the most part, of people of the lower class, were loud in their vociferations and violent in their gestures, yet the Christian party, with whom the better class of citizens seem to have tacitly arranged themselves, was really the most powerful; nor were they destitute of the means of restoring quiet, provided only the first gust of anger, in which there was more noise than efficiency, was suffered to pass by. Besides, the pagan party had no leader combining superior intelligence with hot-headed zeal; and the large number of those who, though they now took the side of the zealots for the restoration of paganism, had yet received some impression from Christianity, might, under a slight turn of circumstances, be easily led to take another step towards the Christian faith. But to bishop Otto this favorable preparation of the popular mind was wholly unknown. He was expecting the worst from the tumultuous frenzy of the Pagans; and placing no reliance whatever on human means, or any concurrence of natural causes; trusting in God alone, and resigned to his will, he went boldly forward to meet the threatening danger, prepared with a cheerful heart to die the death of a martyr. He at first found a place of refuge, for himself and his companions, in a church that stood before the city. As soon as this became known in the town, a band of armed men, led on by priests, collected around this spot, threatening destruction to the church, and death to those that occupied it. Had the bishop given way to fear, or betrayed the least alarm, the furious mob would, perhaps, have proceeded to fulfil their threats. But the courage and presence of mind displayed by the bishop, put a damper on the fury of the threatening mob. Having commended himself and his friends to God in prayer, he walked forth, dressed in his episcopal robes, and surrounded by his clergy, bearing before him the cross and relics, and chanting psalms and hymns. The calmness with which this was done, the awe-inspiring character of the whole proceeding, confounded the multitude. All remained quiet and silent. The more prudent, or the more favorably disposed to Christianity, took advantage of this to put down the excitement. The priests were told that they should defend their cause, not with violence, but with arguments; and one after another the crowd dispersed. This occurred on Friday, and the Saturday following was spent by Otto in preparing himself, by prayer and fasting, for the approaching crisis.

In the mean time, Witstack, stimulated by the bishop's arrival, went forth among the people testifying, with more boldness than ever, in favor of Christianity and against paganism. He brought his friends and kinsmen to the bishop; he exhorted him not to give out in the contest, promised him victory, and advised with him as to the steps which should next be taken. On Sunday, after performing mass, Otto suffered himself to be led by Witstack to the market-place. Mount-

ing the steps, from whence the herald and magistrates were accustomed to address the people, after Witstack by signs and words had enjoined silence, Otto began to speak, and the major part listened silently and with attention to what he said, as it was translated by the interpreter, already mentioned, into the language of the country. But now a tall, well-habited priest, of great bodily strength, pressing forward, drowned the words of both with his shouts, at the same time endeavoring to stir up the anger of the pagans against the enemy of their gods. He called on them to seize upon this opportunity of avenging their deities. Lances were poised; but still no one dared attempt any injury to the bishop. Well might the confident faith and the courage that flowed from it, the perfect composure manifested by the bishop amid this tumultuous scene, the imposing and dignified gravity of his whole demeanor, make a great impression on the multitude, particularly on those who had previously been in any way affected by the influence of Christianity, and had not as yet succeeded in wholly obliterating the impression. Such a fact, in which we must certainly recognize the power of the godlike, might in such a period soon come to be conceived and represented more under the color of the miraculous, and this representation would contribute again to promote the belief in men's minds of the divine power of Christianity. Otto immediately took advantage of the favorable impression thus produced. Proceeding with the crowd of believers that now surrounded him, to the church by which the pagan altar had recently been erected, he consecrated it anew, and caused the injuries it had received to be repaired at his own expense.

On the next day, the people assembled to decide what course ought to be taken with regard to the matter of religion. They remained together from early in the morning until midnight. Individuals appeared who represented all that had occurred on the day before as miraculous, bearing testimony with enthusiasm to the active, self-sacrificing love of the bishop; foremost among these was that zealous Christian and admirer of Otto, Witstack. A decree was passed accordingly, that Christianity should be introduced, and everything that pertained to idolatry destroyed. Witstack hastened the same night to inform the bishop of all that had transpired. The latter rose early the next morning to render thanks to God, at the celebration of the mass. After this he called a meeting of the citizens, where he spoke to them words of encouragement, which were received in the manner to be expected after such a decree of the popular assembly. Many who had apostatized requested to be received back into the community of the faithful.

The winning kindness of Otto's manners, as well as his readiness to take advantage of the most trifling circumstances which could be turned to account in his labors, is illustrated by the following incident. One day, on his way to church, he saw a troop of boys in the street at play, — kindly saluting them in the language of the country, he retorted their jokes, and having signed the cross over them, and given them his blessing, left them. After he had proceeded along a few steps,

looking behind, he observed, that the children attracted by the strange act followed after him. He stopped; and calling the little ones around him, inquired who of them had been baptized? These he exhorted to remain steadfast to their baptismal vow, and to avoid the society of the unbaptized. They took him at his word, and even in the midst of their play listened attentively to his discourse.[1] Still, the zeal of bishop Otto was not always accompanied with befitting prudence; hence he often exposed himself to great peril. While busied in destroying all the pagan temples and monuments of superstition, resolved to let nothing remain which was in anywise adapted so to impress the senses as to promote idolatry, he came across a magnificent nut-tree, whose refreshing shade was enjoyed by many, and which the people of the neighborhood earnestly besought him to spare. But as it was consecrated to a deity, the bishop was too fearful of the dangerous sensuous impression to yield to their wishes. Most indignant of all was the owner of the estate on which the tree stood. After he had stormed about in a frenzy of passion, his anger seemed at length to have spent itself. Suddenly, however, raising his axe behind the back of the bishop, he would have dealt him a fatal blow, had not the latter, at the same moment, inclined himself a little on the other side. All now fell upon the man, and it was the bishop who rescued him out of their hands. Again, during his passage from Stettin, he was threatened by an attack of the pagan party, which, as it diminished in numbers, grew more violent in rancor; but he fortunately escaped. Accompanied by his clergy, and a number of the more respectable citizens of Stettin, he proceeded to Julin, where also, after such an example had been set them by the capital, he labored with good success. Gladly, and without shrinking from a martyr's death, he would have extended his labors also to the island of Rügen, had he not been obliged, in the year 1128, by his engagements as a member of the imperial diet, to return to Germany; so after paying another visit to the new communities, he shaped his course homeward. But, even amidst the manifold cares of his civil and spiritual relations, he did not lose sight of the Pommeranians. On learning that certain Pommeranian Christians had been conveyed into captivity among pagan hordes, he determined to procure their release. He ordered a large quantity of valuable cloth to be purchased in Halle, and sending the whole to Pommerania, where these goods stood in high demand, appropriated a part as presents to the nobles, with a view to secure their kind feelings toward the infant church; and ordered the remainder to be sold and converted into ransom-money for those captives.

But in pushing forward with so much zeal and resolution the mission among the Pommeranians, Otto neglected one thing, which was of the

[1] The unknown biographer introduces this anecdote, l. iii, p. 85, before that popular assembly which decided the question with regard to the introduction of Christianity into Pommerania. But it is plain from the connection of his own account, that it occurred sometime afterwards. From this account, it appears also to have been by no means the fact, — as might be inferred from what he says respecting the effect and consequences of Otto's discourse, held after the above assembly, — that all directly submitted to baptism.

utmost consequence in order to a settled, enduring foundation of Christian culture among the people; and this was, to make provision for the imparting of Christian instruction in the language of the country. There was a want of German clergy, well skilled in the Slavic language, there was a want of institutions for the purpose of giving the native inhabitants an education suited to the spiritual calling. No doubt, both these, owing to the short time employed in the conversion of the people, were wants the supply of which would be attended with great difficulties. But the consequence of it was, that ecclesiastics had to be called out of Germany, who always remained, in national peculiarities, language, and customs, too foreign from these Wends, and had but little true love for them. What contributed to the same evil was, that German colonists, in ever-increasing numbers, were called in to replen ish the territories which had been laid waste and the cities which had been desolated by the preceding wars. These foreigners met the Wends with a sort of contempt. A feud sprung up between the new and the old inhabitants of the land, and the latter were induced to withdraw themselves into the back parts of the country.[1] The same injustice was here done to the aboriginals by the new race of foreigners who settled down in the land, as has often been done over again in later times and in other quarters of the world.

Christianity had not as yet found admittance into the island of Rügen, but its inhabitants still maintained their freedom, and held fast to their ancient sacred customs. Thus the bond of union was severed between these islanders and the Christian Pommeranians. It was not until after repeated battles, that Waldemar king of Denmark at last succeeded, in the year 1168, to subjugate the island; and then the destruction of paganism and the founding of the Christian church first became practicable. The inspiring soul of this enterprise was bishop Absalom, of Roeskilde, a man who conceived it possible to unite in himself the statesman, the warrior, and the bishop;[2] and who was therefore the least fitted of all men to bring about the conversion of a people in the proper sense. Through his mediation, a compact was formed with the inhabitants of the capital town Arcona, which compact laid the foundation for the subjection of the entire island. They obliged themselves by this agreement to renounce paganism, and to introduce among them Christianity, according to the usages of the Danish church. The landed estates of the temples were to devolve on the clergy. When the monstrous idol of Svantovit was to be removed from the city, not a single native-born individual dared lay hands on it, so dreaded by all was the vengeance of the deity. But when the idol had been dragged off to the camp of the Danes, without

[1] Thomas Kantzow's Chronicle of Pommerania, published by W. Böhmer, p. 35.

[2] His ardent friend and eulogist, the famous Danish historian Saxo-Grammaticus, Provost of Roeskilde, who, on his recommendation, undertook his work of history, calls him "militiae et religionis sociato fulgore conspicuus;" this historian and ecclesiastic finding nothing offensive in such a combination. War with pagans for the good of the church, seemed to him not a whit foreign to the character of a bishop. "Neque enim minus sacrorum attinet cultui, publice religionis hostes repellere, quam caeremoniarum tutelae vacare." Lib. xiv, p. 440, ed. Klotz.

any of the anticipated dreadful consequences, some complained of the wrong done to their god; while others considered the ancient faith as already overturned by this experiment, and now ridiculed the monster they had before adored. Still more must this impression have been strengthened in their minds, when they saw the idol hewn in pieces, and the fragments of wood used in the camp for cooking provisions. The clergy living in the service of the nobles were sent into the town to instruct and baptize the people; but as things were in that period, it is hardly to be supposed that among such a clergy, who at the same time served as secretaries to the nobles, much Christian knowledge was to be found. The great temple was burnt, and the foundations laid for a Christian church. The same course was pursued in other parts of the island. The work was prosecuted by priests, whom bishop Absalom sent over from Denmark, after the recall of those ecclesiastics, who were only intended to supply the immediate want. He provided the means for their subsistence, so that they might not be felt as a burden on the people. Many incidents occurred here also by which people were led to ascribe the cure of various diseases to the prayers of the priests. But the historian of this period, though he reports them as miracles, does not profess to consider them as proving the holiness of these ecclesiastics, but only as works of divine grace to facilitate the conversion of that people.[1]

We noticed, in the preceding period, the founding of a great Christian empire of the Wends by Gottschalk. This empire perished, however, with its founder, when he was assassinated; and paganism had revived again under Cruko, a prince very hostilely disposed towards Christianity. Yet Gottschalk's son, Henry, who had taken refuge in Denmark, succeeded, with the help of Christian princes, in putting down the opposition of the pagan Wends, and by his means, in 1105, the Wendish kingdom was restored. He endeavored also to reëstablish Christianity. But when he died, in the year 1126, his two sons, Canute and Zwentipolk, fell into a quarrel with each other, which could not fail to operate disastrously on the interests of the Wendish people, both in a political and in an ecclesiastical point of view. With these two sons, the family of Gottschalk became extinct; and the people, who along with their liberties defended also their ancient sacred customs, saw themselves abandoned without mercy to the power of the Christian princes of Germany. It was not till after the margrave Albert the Bear, and duke Henry the Lion, had wholly subdued the Wends, that the Christian church could establish itself in this part of Germany on a solid foundation, and that the bishoprics previously founded could be restored. But the war-wasted districts were peopled by foreign Christian colonists from other quarters of Germany; and what the spirit of Christianity required, namely, that the national individuality should be preserved inviolate, and, ennobled by true religion, should be unfolded to a higher order of perfection, was

[1] Saxo: "Quod potius lucrandae gentis respectui, quam sacerdotum sanctitati divinitus concessum videri potest."

left unaccomplished. It would be remote from the present design, to give an account of wars, which could be of no real service in extending the kingdom of Christ among these tribes.

We pass on to mention *one* individual, who, in the midst of disorder and destruction, endeavored, with self-denying love, to labor for the saving good of the nations. This was *Vicelin*. Sprung from a family of the middle class at Quernheim, a village on the banks of the Weser, and early deprived of his parents, he found pity with a woman of noble birth, who took him to her castle, Everstein, where she suffered him to want for nothing. A question put to him by the envious priest of the village, with a view to embarrass and shame him, brought him to the consciousness and confession of his ignorance. But this incident, which he himself regarded as a gracious act of Divine Providence,[1] turned out to him a salutary incentive, and gave a new direction to his life. Filled with shame, he immediately left the castle, and betaking himself to the then flourishing school at Paderborn, applied himself to study with so much diligence and application, that Hartmann, the master of that school, had little else to do than to check and moderate his zeal. In a short time, he made such progress in the acquisition of knowledge that his master made him an assistant in the school. Somewhat later, he was called himself to take the superintendence of a school in Bremen. After presiding over this institution for a few years with great zeal, his earnest longing after a more complete education impelled him to visit that far-famed seat of science, then filled with lovers of learning from all parts of Europe, the Parisian University. Here, it was not the predominant dialectic tendency, for which the University of Paris was especially famous, but the simple biblical tendency, by which he felt himself to be most strongly attracted. After having spent three years at this University (A. D. 1125), he thought he might venture on a step from which distrust in his youth, still exposed to temptations, had hitherto deterred him, and to receive the priestly consecration. Presently, he was seized also with a desire to convey the blessing of the gospel to those parts where it was most greatly needed. The report of what the Wendish king Henry was doing for the establishment of the Christian church among his people, drew him to that quarter. Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, gave him a commission to preach the gospel to the Slavonians. Two other ecclesiastics, Rudolph, a priest from Hildesheim, and Ludolf, a canonical from Verden, joined him as fellow-laborers in the sacred enterprise. King Henry, to whom they offered their services, received them readily, showing them great respect, and assigning to them a church in Lubec, where he himself usually resided, as the seat of their labors. Before they could commence them, however, the king died; and the ensuing wars between his sons rendered it impossible for them to effect anything in that district. Vicelin now returned back to archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, whom he attended

[1] Helmold, vide vol. iii, p. 323, whose report we here follow, says of him, i, 142: "Audivi eum saepenumero dicentem, quia ad verbum illius sacerdotis respexerit eum misericordia divina."

on his tour of visitation in a diocese, the borders of which were inhabited by Slavic tribes. It so happened that, in the year 1126, when Vicelin was accompanying the archbishop on such a tour of visitation, the inhabitants of the border-town Faldera,[1] applied to the latter for a priest to reside amongst them. A convenient centre was here presented to Vicelin for his labors among the Slavonians, and he gladly accepted the call. He found here a poor, uncultivated country, rendered desolate by many wars, numbers who were Christians only in name, manifold remains of idolatry, groves and fountains consecrated to the deities. He preached with energy and effect; the truths, which were as yet wholly new to the rude multitude, found ready entrance into their minds. He destroyed the remaining objects of idolatrous worship, travelled about in the northern districts of the Elbe, and made it the aim of his preaching not to convert the people into nominal Christians merely, but to lead them to repentance and to a genuine Christian temper of mind. His pious, indefatigable activity stimulated others to imitate his example. A free society was instituted of unmarried laymen and ecclesiastics, who, under his guidance, entered into a mutual agreement to devote themselves to a life of prayer, charity, and self-mortification; to visit the sick, to relieve the necessities of the poor, to labor for their own salvation, and that of others, and especially to pray and labor for the conversion of the Slavonians. A spiritual society of this sort being one of the wants of the time, belonging to that peculiar spirit of fraternization, with which the awakening religious life readily united itself, gave birth to many others, like those religious associations called the apostolical. When the emperor Lothaire the Second, in the year 1134, visited the province of Holstein, Vicelin found that he took a warm interest in his plan for the establishment of the Christian church among the Slavonians. By Vicelin's advice, the emperor built a fortress at Segeberg to protect the country against the Slavonians; a proceeding which, it must be allowed, was hardly calculated to make a favorable impression on that people; for the Slaves looked upon it as a new mode of infringing upon their liberties. Here it was now proposed to erect a new church, which was to be committed to the care of Vicelin. To him, the emperor intrusted also the care of the church in Lubec; and consequently, the entire direction of the mission among the Slavonians was placed in his hands. At Segeberg and Lubec, he could now proceed to establish a seminary for missionaries among that people; but by the political quarrels and disturbances, which followed the death of Lothaire, in 1137, his labors here were again interrupted. Those districts once more fell a prey to the fury of the Slavonians; the Christian foundations were destroyed, the clergy obliged to flee, and the labors of Vicelin were again confined to Faldera alone. But even this spot was not long spared from the ravages of the Slavonians. Vicelin took occasion, from these calamities, to direct the attention of men from perishable things to eternal, teaching them to find

[1] As it was named by the Wends; otherwise, Wippendorf; at a later period, Neumünster.

in the gospel the true source of trust and consolation in God. After having passed several years under these distressing circumstances, his outward situation was again changed for the better by the establishment of the authority of duke Adolph of Holstein in these districts, after the subjugation of the Slaves. This new sovereign carried out the plans already contemplated by the emperor Lothaire, in favor of Vicelin, not only restoring the church at Segeberg, but also giving back the landed estates which had been presented to it by the emperor. But to avoid the bustle and confusion of the fortress, Vicelin removed the monastery to the neighboring city of Högelsdorf, a place more favorably situated to secure the quiet necessary for the spiritual life. When, at a later period, the war broke out afresh with the Slavonians, and in consequence of it a famine arose in those districts, Vicelin, by his exhortations and example, stirred up the spirit of benevolence. Large bodies of poor people daily presented themselves before the gates of the monastery at Högelsdorf. Presiding over the monastery was a scholar of Vicelin's, the priest Dittmar, a man of similar spirit, who had relinquished a canonicate at Bremen, for the purpose of joining the pious society. Dittmar exhausted all his resources in endeavoring to alleviate the prevailing distress. Meanwhile, these Slavic tribes were completely subdued by duke Henry the Lion; and archbishop Hartwig of Bremen, having it now in his power to restore the ruined bishoprics, consecrated Vicelin, in the year 1148, as bishop of Oldenburg. But the man who, during this long series of years, had freely labored, according to his own principles, serving only the pure interests of Christianity, instead of finding himself now, in his old age, enabled to act more independently in this higher dignity, saw himself cramped and confined in various ways by a foreign spirit, and by other interests.[1] As the duke had already been vexed, because the archbishop had renewed those bishoprics without his advice and concurrence, and nominated Vicelin bishop of a city in his own territory, so he thought he might at least demand that the latter should receive from him the investiture. Vicelin, who by virtue of the genuine Christian spirit which actuated him, rose superior to the interests of the hierarchy and of the episcopal prerogative, would gladly have yielded the point at once, in order to preserve a good understanding with the duke, and to avoid being disturbed in his spiritual labors; but the archbishop of Bremen and his clergy positively forbade it; since they looked upon it as a pitiable disgrace to the church that the bishop should receive the investiture from any other hands than those of the emperor.[2] He was now exposed, therefore, to suffer many vexations and embarrassments from the duke. He could not get hold of the revenues which belonged to him. Mean-

[1] His friend Helmold says: "Videres virum antea magni nominis, possessorem libertatis et compotem suimet post acceptum episcopale nomen, quasi innodatum vinculis quibusdam et supplicem omnium."

[2] Helmold says of these clergymen: "Nam et ipsi vaniglorii et divitiis adultae ecclesiae saturi, honori suo hoc in facto derogari putabant, nec magnopere fructum, sed numerum suffraganearum sedium curabant."

while, he did what he could, and in particular took great pains to perform the tours of visitation in his diocese. He labored earnestly in preaching the gospel to the Slavonians, yet he met with but little success among them. Finding himself so much embarrassed in the discharge of his official duties by his misunderstanding with the duke, he finally resolved to sacrifice the respect due to his ecclesiastical superiors to the higher interest of the welfare of souls. Therefore, he said to the duke, "For the sake of him who humbled himself on our account, I am ready to do homage to each one of your vassals, to say nothing of yourself, a prince exalted to so high a station by the Lord." By this concession, he involved himself in unpleasant relations with his archbishop. At last, he had the misfortune to lose the faithful friend, who labored on in the same spirit with himself, the priest Dittmar. During the last two years and a half of his life, he saw himself completely shut out from all official labors; for he was so severely affected by repeated shocks of apoplexy, that he could neither move, nor even control his organs of speech. All that remained in his power was to exert himself for the edification of others by the tranquillity and patience which he manifested under the severest sufferings. Like the apostle John, and Gregory of Utrecht,[1] he had to be borne to the church on the shoulders of his disciples. He died on the 13th of December, 1154.

The Christian church was again planted during this period among the Slavic populations in the countries on the coasts of the Baltic sea. This work we will now contemplate more in detail. The attempts made by the Danish kings to convert men by force, had, in this region also, only served to diffuse more widely the hatred against Christianity and the Christians. It was by means of commerce that more peaceful relations came finally to be established between the *Lieflanders* and Christian nations. This was an important preparation for the work of missions, by which more could be effected for the introduction of Christianity and the well-being of the nations, than by any of the attempts to combine the chivalric spirit with Christian zeal. In the year 1158, merchants of Bremen began to form commercial connections with the Lieflanders and the bordering tribes. Their ships often visited the Düna, where they established settlements for trade. The priest Meinhard, from the already-mentioned monastery of Segeberg in Holstein, a venerable old man, was moved by a pious zeal, even in his old age, to embark in one of the enterprises of these merchants, with a view to convey the message of salvation to the pagan people. In the year 1186, he arrived on the spot. He got permission from the Russian prince Wladimir, of Plozk, to preach the gospel to the Lieflanders; and at Yxküll, beyond Riga, where the merchants had already built a fortress for the security of trade, he founded the first church. A number of the first men of the nation consented to receive baptism from him. On a certain occasion, when the Lieflanders were attacked by pagan tribes from Lithuania, Meinhard di-

[1] See vol. iii, p. 73.

rected the measures for defence, and under his guidance the invaders were repelled. By this transaction, he won their confidence still more. He taught them, moreover, how to guard against such attacks for the future, instructing them in the art of fortification, of which they were entirely ignorant. On their promising to submit to baptism, he sent to Gothland for workmen and building materials, and erected two fortresses, at Yxküll and Holm, for the protection of the people. But more than once he was compelled, by bitter experience, to find that those who had suffered themselves to be baptized only to obtain his assistance in their bodily necessities, when they had secured their object, relapsed into paganism, and sought to wash away their baptism in the waters of the Düna. Meinhard, in the mean while, was on a journey to Bremen, where he went to make a report of the success he had met with to his archbishop and to the pope. Archbishop Hartwig of Bremen, ordained him bishop over the new church; but very much still needed to be done before he could discharge the functions of the episcopal office. After his return, he found how grossly he had been deceived by those Lieflanders who had needed his assistance in temporal things.

To aid in sustaining this work, Theodoric, a Cistercian monk, had come upon the ground, and settled down at Threida (Thoreida). But the pagans took a dislike to him; for the superior condition of his fields had aroused their jealousy. Already, they thought of sacrificing him to their deities. Whilst they were deliberating on the matter, he called upon God in prayer. The omen which, according to Slavic custom, they took from the steppings of a horse which they kept for divination,[1] turned out favorably for him, and his life was spared. At another time, he was brought into great peril by an eclipse of the sun, the people attributing this terror-spreading phenomenon to his magical arts. The rude pagans were easy to believe that one so superior to themselves in knowledge and culture was able to do anything; so a wounded man once applied to him to be healed, promising that, if he obtained relief, he would be baptized. Theodoric had no knowledge of medicine; but trusting in God, whose assistance he invoked, he composed a mixture of crushed herbs, and as the remedy was followed by a cure, the patient, one of the principal men of the nation, submitted to baptism. This example had its effect upon others. But it was with manifold vexations, anxieties, and dangers, that Meinhard had to struggle to the last. Sometimes the Lieflanders, when they had an object to gain by it, or when they felt afraid that an armed force might be coming to his assistance, were ready to promise anything; and when he was on the point of leaving them, strove to retain him in their country; at other times, they only mocked him. Already, he had applied to the pope to assist him in this enterprise, and the latter had promised to do so, when, in the year 1196, he died alone at Yxküll; but not till he had obtained a promise from the Lieflanders that they would consent to receive another bishop. Berthold, abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Lockum, was appointed his successor,

[1] See ante, p. 15.

and consecrated as a bishop over the new church. It was his intention at first, not to resort to the sword, but to gain over the minds of the Lieflanders by the power of the truth and of love; he only failed to persevere in this good resolution. He came to Liefland without an armed force, called together, near the church at Yxküll, the better disposed amongst the Christians and pagans, supplied them bountifully with food and drink, distributed presents among them, and then said that, called by themselves, he came there to supply the place of their departed bishop. At first, they received him in a friendly manner; but soon he had to hear of plots among the pagans, who were resolved to put him to death. The consequence of this was an armed crusade, at the head of which the new bishop returned back to Liefland. He himself, it is true, fell in battle, but the army was victorious. The Lieflanders sued for peace; they declared themselves willing to receive clergymen, and a hundred and fifty of the people already consented to receive baptism. The army of crusaders was thus induced to leave the country; but nothing better was to be expected, than that the Lieflanders, when no longer restrained by fear, would soon return to their old practices. Scarcely had the army of the Germans left their shores, than they again renounced Christianity; two hundred Christians were put to death; the clergy barely made out to save themselves by flight, and the Christian merchants themselves could only purchase security for their lives by presents to the principal men. The canonical priest, Albert von Apeldern of Bremen, was appointed bishop of the new church, and a fresh army accompanied him, in the year 1199, to Liefland. After the successful termination of the new campaign, in order to fix a stable seat for the Christian church on a spot more secure and better situated for intercourse with the Christian world, the town of Riga was built, in the year 1200, and the bishopric of Yxküll translated to this place. But it was necessary that an armed force should be kept always at hand here, not only to maintain possession of the place, and to secure the Christian foundations, in a constant struggle with the pagan inhabitants of the country; but also to ward off the destructive inroads of other pagan tribes in the neighborhood, and to resist the Russian princes on the border, who were impatient of any foreign dominion in these parts. To this end, a standing order of spiritual knights, formed in accordance with the spirit of these times, by a union of knighthood with the clerical vocation, the *ordo fratrum militiæ Christi*, was instituted, which chose the Virgin Mary, to whom the new bishopric had been dedicated, as its patroness.

Not till after a war of twenty years was tranquillity secured. From this point, the church was planted in Esthland and Semgallen; and at length Curland also, in the year 1230, submitted to her sway; not compelled by outward force, but yet driven by fear.

It would be foreign from our purpose to enter farther into the history of these warlike enterprises. We will simply notice in these movements, so alien from Christianity, such particulars as present to our observation the least trace of the Christian spirit. In the midst

of these wars, men did not entirely neglect to employ the method of persuasion, and to diffuse Christian knowledge, though they did not adopt the most suitable means for this purpose. Among these means, belonged the spiritual plays which came into vogue in this period, and were designed to represent historical scenes from the Old and New Testaments. Thus during an interim of peace, in the year 1204, the opportunity was taken advantage of to exhibit, in the recently built city of Riga, a prophetical play, designed to combine entertainment and instruction for the new Christians and the pagans, and to fix by sensuous impressions the sacred stories and doctrines more deeply on their minds.[1] By means of interpreters, the subjects of these dramatical representations were more clearly explained to them. When Gideon's troop attacked the Philistines, great terror fell on the pagan spectators, as they supposed it applied to themselves. They betook themselves to flight, and it was only after much persuasion that their confidence could be restored.[2] When again, after a bloody war and deliverance from great dangers, a time of peace once more returned, archbishop Andreas of Lund, who came in company with the allied Danes, assembled, in the winter of 1205, all the clergy in Riga, and during the whole season, gave them theological discourses on the Psalter.[3] Many amongst the clergy, for which order men were fond of selecting monks, devoted themselves in good earnest to the work of promoting the salvation of the Lieflanders. One of these was monk Sigfrid, who presided as priest and pastor over the church at Holm, and by his life of piety and devotion left a deep impression on the minds of the people. At his death in the year 1202, the new converts zealously went to work and made him a beautiful coffin, in which they bore him, weeping, to the place of burial.[4]

Over the church connected with the recently built fortress, Friedland, was placed a priest of the Cistercian order, Frederic of Celle. On Palm-Sunday of the year 1213 he had celebrated mass with great devotion and then preached with much fervor on the passion of Christ, closing his discourse with touching words of exhortation addressed to the new Christians. After having here celebrated also the Easter festival, he was intending to cross over with his assistants and a few of his new Christians to Riga. But on the passage they were surprised by a vessel fully manned with ferocious pagans from the island of Correzar (Ozilia), a haunt of pirates, which had offered the stoutest and longest resistance to the introduction of Christianity. Under the cruel tortures, with which the exasperated pagans sought to put him

[1] Thus a man, who was in part an eye-witness of these events, the priest Heinrich der Lette, in the Chronicon Livonicum f. 34, published by Gruber, says: "Ut fidei Christianae rudimenta gentilitas fide etiam disceret oculata."

[2] The priest Heinrich expresses more truth than he seems himself to be conscious of, when he considers this dramatical exhibition as a foretoken of the calamities of the following years: "In eodem ludo erant bella, utpote David, Gideonis, Herodis. Erat et doctrina veteris et novi testamenti, quia nimirum per bella plurima, quae sequuntur, convertenda erat gentilitas, et per doctrinam veteris et novi testamenti erat instruenda, qualiter ad verum pacificum et ad vitam perveniat sempiternam."

[3] The words of the above-mentioned priest: "Et legendo in Psalterio totam hiemem in divina contemplatione deducuntur." L. c. f. 43.

[4] L. c. f. 26.

to a lingering death, he lifted his eyes to heaven and with his disciples thanked God, that he had counted him worthy of martyrdom.[1] In the year 1206, the Letti made a desolating irruption into Liefland, and a village near Threida was suddenly attacked by them, whilst the community were assembled in the church. When this became known, the Lieflanders, in great consternation, rushed from the church; some succeeded in finding places of concealment in the neighboring forest; others, who hurried to their dwellings, were taken captive on the way, and some of them put to death. But the priest, John Strick, supported by another priest and by his servants, would not be disturbed in his devotions at the celebration of the mass; but consecrating himself to God as an offering, committed his life into the hands of his Master, resigned to suffer whatever he should appoint. And after they had finished the mass, placing the several articles which belonged to the celebration of the office, in a heap together at one corner of the sacristy, they concealed themselves in the same spot. Three several times the troops of the Letti broke into the sanctuary, but seeing the altar stripped of its furniture, they gave up the hope of finding the plunder they were in search of, that which was concealed escaping their notice. When all had gone off, the priests thanked God for their deliverance; in the evening, they forsook the church and fled into the forest, where, for three days, they subsisted on the bread they took with them. On the fourth day they arrived at Riga.[2]

In a fight between the converted Letti and the pagans of Esthland, which took place in the year 1207, a Lettian priest mounted a redoubt, and sang a sacred hymn to the praise of God, accompanying his voice with an instrument. The rude pagans, on hearing the soft melody of the song and its accompaniment, a thing altogether new to them, for a time left off fighting, and demanded what the occasion was for such expressions of joy. "We rejoice," said the Letti, "and we praise God, because but a short time ago we received baptism, and now see that God defends us."[3]

Amongst these people, the influence of Christianity was manifest again in the fact that it brought them to a conscious sense of the equal dignity of all men, doing away amongst them the arbitrary and false distinction of higher and lower races. The Letti had, in fact, been hitherto regarded and treated as an inferior race of men; but through Christianity they attained to the consciousness of possessing equal worth and equal rights with all; the priests, therefore, to whom they were indebted for so great an improvement of their condition, were received by them with joy.[4] The only law that had hitherto been in force amongst the Lieflanders was club-law. By means of Christianity, they were first made conscious of the need of a settled system of justice. The inhabitants of Threida made a petition to their priest

[1] L. c. f. 97.

[2] L. c. f. 49.

[3] L. c. f. 57.

[4] The words of the priest Heinrich: "Erant enim Letthi ante fidem susceptam humiles et despecti, et multas injurias sustinentes a Livonibus et Estonibus, unde ipsi magis gaudebant de adventu sacerdotum, eo quod post baptismum eodem jure et eadem pace omnes gauderunt." L. c. f. 56

Hildebrand, that the civil as well as the ecclesiastical law might be introduced amongst them, and that their disputes might be settled by it.[1]

At the close of the war in 1224, pope Honorius the Third, in compliance with the request of the bishop of Riga, sent William, bishop of Modena, the papal chancellor, as a legate to Liefland. This prelate spared no pains in dispensing amongst the ancient inhabitants of the country and their conquerors, such exhortations as their respective circumstances required. The Germans, he exhorted to mildness in their behavior to the new converts; charging them to lay on their shoulders no intolerable burdens, but only the light and easy yoke, and to instruct them constantly in the sacred truths.[2] He cautioned those who bore the sword against being too hard on the Esthlanders, in the collection of tythes and imposts, lest they should be driven to relapse into idolatry.[3] These exhortations to a mild, indulgent treatment of the natives, he repeated, on various occasions, amongst the different classes.

With the establishment of the Christian church in these lands, was closely connected its establishment also amongst another Slavic people, the Prussians; for that same order of spiritual knights, which had been founded for the purpose of giving stability to the Christian foundations in Liefland, formed a union with another order for the accomplishment of this work. We must now revert to many things strictly belonging to the preceding period, but which, for the sake of preserving the connection of events, we reserved to the present occasion.

Adalbert of Prague,[4] the archbishop who had to endure so many hard conflicts with the rudeness of his people, betook himself, after he had abandoned his bishopric for the third time, to Boleslav the First, duke of Poland, expecting to find amongst the pagans in this quarter a field of activity suited to the glowing ardor of his zeal. He finally determined to go amongst the Prussians. The duke gave him a vessel, and thirty soldiers to protect him. Thus attended he sailed to Dantzic,[5] as this was the frontier-place between Prussia and Poland. Here he first made his appearance as a preacher of the gospel, and he succeeded in baptizing numbers. Then sailing from this place, and landing on the opposite coast, he sent back the ship and her crew. He desired to commit himself, as a messenger of peace, wholly to God's protection. He did not choose to appear standing under the protection of any human power, but would avoid everything which might awaken suspicion amongst the pagans. The only persons he kept with him were the priest Benedict and his own pupil Gaudentius. It was an open beach where they were set down; and taking a small boat, they rowed to an island formed at the mouth of the river Pregel.[6]

[1] L. c. f. 46. The priest Heinrich says, that the Lieflanders were at first very well satisfied with their judges, or so-called advocates; namely, so long as pious men, who were governed only by Christian motives, administered this office. But it turned out otherwise, when laymen, who sought only how they might enrich themselves, obtained these posts.

[2] "Ne Teutonici gravaminis aliquod jugum importabile neophytorum humeris imponerent, sed jugum Domini leve ac suave, fideique semper docerent sacramenta."

[3] L. c. f. 173.

[4] See vol. iii, p. 322.

[5] Gedania.

[6] As may be gathered from the words of the ancient account of his life, Mens

But the owners of the land approached with cudgels to drive them away, and one dealt him so severe a blow with an oar, that the psalter, from which he was singing, dropped from his hand, and he fell to the ground. As soon as he had recovered himself he said, "I thank thee, Lord, for the privilege thou hast bestowed on me of suffering even a blow for my crucified Saviour." On Saturday, they rowed to the other shore of the Pregel, on the coast of Sameland. The lord of the domain, whom they happened to meet, conducted them to his village. A large body of people collected together. When Adalbert had given an account of himself, of the country he came from, and of his errand, the people told him they wanted to hear nothing about a foreign law, and threatened them all with death unless they sailed off the same night. Compelled to leave these coasts, they turned back again, tarrying five days in a village where they brought up. Here, on the night of Thursday, the brother Gaudentius had a dream, which next morning he related to the bishop. He saw standing on the middle of the altar a golden chalice half filled with wine. He asked permission to drink from it, but the servant of the altar forbade him. Neither he nor any other person could be allowed to drink from it, said he. It was reserved against the morrow, for the bishop, to give him spiritual strength. "May the Lord's blessing," said Adalbert, on hearing this, "bring to pass what this vision promises; but we should place no confidence in a deceitful dream." At the break of day, they proceeded on their journey, cheerily making their way through the pathless woods, shortening the distance with spiritual songs. About noon they came to some open fields. Here Gaudentius celebrated the mass: Adalbert received the cup, then took some refreshment, and after they had proceeded a few steps farther, the three seated themselves upon the grass. Wearied with travel, they all fell into a profound sleep, which lasted till they were awakened by the noise of a tumultuous band of pagans, who seized and bound them in chains. Said Adalbert to his companions, "Be not troubled, my brethren, we know, indeed, for whose name we suffer. What is there more glorious, than to give up life for our precious Jesus." Upon this Siggo, a priest, plunged a lance through his body; the others then vented their rage upon him. Adalbert, streaming with blood, kept his head erect and his eyes fixed on heaven. This happened on the 23d of April 997.[1]

The second person who attempted to convert the Prussians was Bruno, surnamed Bonifacius.[2] He was descended from a family of

April, t. iii, c. vi, fol. 186: "Intrant parvam insulam, quae curvo amne circumjecta formam circuli adeuntibus monstrat." See Voigt's remarks, respecting these specified marks in relation to the geographical situation of the place, in his Geschichte von Preussen, Bd. i. s. 267.

[1] We certainly cannot doubt, that the circumstantial and simple narrative came from the mouth of one of Adalbert's companions, who probably were redeemed from their captivity among the Prussians by duke Boleslav; for the author of the second account of Adalbert's life states, that the Prussians preserved his body with a view of afterwards disposing of it for a large ransom to duke Boleslav.

[2] This surname was the occasion of a mistake, two different persons having been made out of these two names, and a missionary Boniface was invented, who is to be wholly stricken out of the list of historical persons.

note in Querfurt, and became court-chaplain of the emperor Otho the Third, who valued him highly on account of his spiritual attainments. This monarch took him along with him in a journey to Rome, where perhaps it was the sight of a picture of Boniface, the apostle to the Germans, which led him to resolve on withdrawing from court, becoming a monk, and conveying the message of salvation to the heathen nations. Carrying this resolution into effect, he became a monk of the order of St. Benedict. He procured from Silvester the Second, full powers to engage in a mission to the heathen. This pope conferred on him, for the same end, episcopal ordination, and the pall of an archbishop. With eighteen companions he repaired, in 1007, to Prussia: but all perished by martyrdom on the 14th of February, 1008.

From this time two centuries elapsed, during which, so far as we know, nothing farther was done for the conversion of the Prussians. It was not until 1207, that any new attempt was made for this purpose. At that time, Gottfried, a Polish abbot, from the monastery of Lukina, sailed down the Weichsel, in company with Philip, a monk; and they succeeded in gaining the confidence of the heads of the people. Two of these, Phalet and his brother Sodrach, embraced Christianity and received baptism. At this point the work was interrupted, indeed, by the assassination of monk Philip; but some years later another man appeared, who was far better calculated for such an enterprise, and who began his work with more promising results. *Christian*, a native of Freienwalde, in Pommerania, went forth at that time from the monastery of Oliva, near Dantzic, where, perhaps, the reports he heard concerning the Prussians and the first attempts which were made to convert them, had served to call forth in him the desire of conveying to them the message of salvation. With several other monks, among whom one in particular is mentioned, named Philip, he repaired, after having first obtained ample authority for this work from pope Innocent the Third,[1] to the adjacent province of Prussia. The happy results of his labors in Prussia induced him, perhaps in accordance with some agreement between him and the pope, in the years 1209 and 1210, to make a journey to Rome. Innocent the Third, espoused this cause with that active zeal and prudent forethought, embracing the interests of the whole church, for which he was distinguished. He committed to the archbishop of Gnesen, the pastoral care over this mission and the new converts, till their number should be such as to require the labors of a special bishop of their own. In his letter addressed to this archbishop,[2] he says, "Through the grace of him who calls into being that which is not, and who out of stones

[1] As pope Innocent the Third, in his letter to the archbishop of Gnesen, epp. l. xiii, ep. 128, says, expressly, concerning Christian and his companions: "Ad partes Prussiae de nostra licentia accesserunt;" and in the letter to the Cistercian abbots, l. xv, ep. 147: "*Olim* de nostra licentia inceperunt seminare in partibus Prussiae verbum Dei," it is impossible to doubt, that the monks at the very beginning, either orally or by letter reported their project to the pope, and received from him ample powers for such an enterprise. From this particular point of time it was also the first in which resort was had in such an enterprise to the head of the church.

[2] L. c. l. xiii, ep. 128

raises up sons to Abraham, a few of the nobles and some others in that region have received baptism; and would that they might daily make progress in the knowledge of the true faith." Christian and his companions returned and prosecuted their labors with good success. But from one quarter, where they had every reason to expect countenance and support, they experienced hindrances of all sorts in the prosecution of their work. The Cistercian abbots grew jealous of the independent activity of these men; they put them in the same class with those vagabond monks, who had broken loose from all discipline and order. They refused to acknowledge them as brethren of their order, and denied them those kindly offices which in all other cases the members of the order were wont to show to each other. Therefore the pope issued in behalf of this mission, in the year 1213, a letter addressed to the abbots of the Cistercian chapter.[1] With the cautious wisdom manifested by this pope on other occasions, he intended, on the one hand, to restrain those monks who merely wished to throw off the forms of legitimate dependence, from roving about, uncalled, as missionaries; and, on the other, to provide that the preaching of the gospel should not be hindered under the pretext of checking such disorders. To secure these ends, the whole matter was placed under the general oversight of the archbishop of Gnesen. He was to apply the right rules for the trying of the spirits, and to furnish those, whom he found qualified to preach and influenced by the spirit of love, with testimonials of good standing and letters of recommendation. The pope commanded the Cistercian abbots to forbear from hindering in their work such persons as were thus accredited. Furthermore, the pope had heard complaints, that the dukes of Pommerania and of Poland, turned the introduction of Christianity into a means of oppressing the Prussians; that they laid on the Christians heavier burdens than they had previously borne; which, as had often been shown in the case of the Slavic tribes, might end in making Christianity hateful to the people, whose burdens it only served to increase, and to bring about the ruin of the whole mission.[2] He therefore sent to these princes a letter, couched in firm and decided language, setting before them the unchristian character of such proceedings. "Although, in the words of the apostle, without faith it is impossible to please God, still, faith alone is not sufficient for this purpose; but love is, in an especial manner, also necessary. As the apostle says: though one may have faith so as to be able to remove mountains, and though one may speak with the tongues of angels and of men, and though one give his whole substance to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth him nothing. Now if, according to the law of Christ, this love is to be extended even to our enemies, how much more is it incumbent on all to practice it towards the newly converted, inasmuch as they, if

[1] L. c. l. xv, ep. 147.

[2] "Quidam vestrum," says the pope, in his letter to them, l. xv, ep. 148 — "minime attendentes, et quaerentes, quae sua sunt, non quae Christi, quam cito intelligunt aliquos e gentilibus per Prussiam constitutis novae regenerationis gratiam suscepisse, statim oneribus eos servilibus aggravant et venientes ad Christianae fidei libertatem deterioris conditionis efficiunt quam essent, dum sub jugo servitutis pristinae permanserint."

hardly dealt with, may easily be led into apostasy." "We therefore beseech and exhort you," continues the pope, "for the sake of him who came to save the lost, and to give his life a ransom for many, do not oppress the sons of this new plantation, but treat them with the more gentleness, as they are liable to be misled, and to relapse into paganism; since the old bottles can scarcely hold the new wine." We find from this letter, that Innocent had empowered the archbishop of Gnesen to pronounce the bann on the oppressors of the new converts in Prussia, if they would not listen to reason.

So the monk Christian succeeded in overcoming these difficulties, and his work for the first time went prosperously onward. Two princes whom he had converted made over to him their territory, as a possession for the new church. He travelled with them to Rome; they were there baptized, and Christian was now consecrated to the office of bishop. But after his return, a stormy insurrection arose on the part of his pagan people, provoked perhaps, in part, by the conduct of the above-mentioned Christian princes. Then similar enterprises followed to those which had taken place in Liefland. The order of German knights, founded during the crusades in the twelfth century, joined themselves for the purpose of engaging in them with the order of the Brethren of the Sword; and it was not till after a long series of years, in the year 1283, that the work was completed; four bishoprics having been previously, in the year 1243, founded for the Prussians; — Kulm, Pomesanien, Ermeland, and Sameland.

Nearly after the same manner was the church planted amongst the Finns. King Eric, of Sweden, whose zeal for the church caused him to be venerated as a saint, undertook for this purpose — inasmuch as the Finns could not be induced to submit in a peaceable manner — a crusade, in which he was accompanied by bishop Heinrich, of Upsala. A characteristic trait, indicating the point of religious development at which he stood, and the strong inclination of his times to cling to external things, is related of him. Kneeling down to thank God, after having won a battle, he was observed to be profusely weeping: and being asked the reason, confessed that it was for pity and commisseration at the fate of so many who had fallen in the fight without being baptized, and were consequently lost, when they might have been saved by the holy sacrament.[1]

Let us now throw a glance at the spread of Christianity in *Asia*. It lay in the power of the *Nestorians* to do the most for this object; for their communities were widely scattered over eastern Asia; they were more favored by the Mohammedan princes than any of the other Christian sects;[2] and were the most familiarly acquainted with the languages and customs of the Asiatic nations. Till within the ninth century, the Nestorian church[3] still maintained flourishing schools for the education of their clergy; but after that time these schools seem

[1] See the vita s. Erici. Mens. Maj. d. 18, c. i.

[2] See, on this point, the extracts from Oriental sources in Assemani Bibliotheca orientalis, t. iii, f. 95 etc.

[3] See vol. ii, p. 183, n. 1.

to have declined. What we learn concerning the Nestorian ecclesiastics who roved about Asia, proves, that they were often greatly wanting in theological culture, Christian knowledge, and sedateness of Christian character. It is true, they were animated by a zeal for making proselytes; but they were also too often satisfied if people did but profess Christianity outwardly, and observe a certain set of Christian or ecclesiastical usages. We should be the more cautious, therefore, in receiving those reports which Nestorians, inclined to speak extravagantly concerning the merits of their sect, and habituated to the language of Oriental exaggeration, have made respecting their labors for the conversion of pagan tribes. They spread themselves over those districts of Asia, in which a certain inclination to the mixing together of different religions always existed. A way was easily found of introducing many things from Christianity into this medley; and the Nestorians might represent this as conversion to Christianity.

Thus, for example, we find, sometime after the twelfth century, a legend current in the Western church, respecting a powerful Christian empire in Asia, whose Christian kings, it was said, were at the same time priests, and bore the name of John. By the concurrent testimony of all the accounts from Oriental sources[1] and Western travellers of the thirteenth century, it is evident beyond a doubt, that the kingdom of Keraït in Tartary, lying north of Sina (China), whose residential capital was the city of Caracorum, was here meant. It may be more doubtful, what opinion should be formed respecting the Christianity of this people and of its princes, respecting the union of the sacerdotal and kingly offices in the persons of the latter, and respecting the name of John.

The Nestorian metropolitan Ebedjesu, bishop of Maru in Chorasan, in Persia, relates, in a letter to his patriarch Maris,[2] that a king of Keraït, in the beginning of the eleventh century, had been converted to Christianity by means of Christian merchants, certainly Nestorians.[3] The prince, it is said, thereupon sent a request to the metropolitan, that he would either come to him personally, or else send a priest to baptize him. The patriarch, to whom Ebedjesu reported this, is said to have empowered him to send to that country two priests, together with deacons and ecclesiastical vessels. Two hundred thousand people of this nation are said to have embraced Christianity; the priest above mentioned, and his descendants, were known henceforth in the East, by the name of the priest-kings, John, (Prester John.) Various exaggerated stories concerning the power of these princes, and the extent of their empire, were spread abroad by monks in the West. Envoys from them appeared in Rome, sent

[1] See extracts in Assemani, l. c. f. 486. Ssanang Ssetsen's Geschichte der Ostmongolen, translated from the Mongol language by Schmidt, p. 87. Petersburg, 1829.

[2] See Assemani's Bibliothek, l. c. p. 484.

[3] This is ascribed to the apparition of a saint, who pointed out the right path to the prince, when he had lost his way in a chase; whether the truth is, that some actual occurrence lies at bottom of the story, or that this account is a mere imitation of other similar ones, as that respecting the conversion of the Iberians, see vol. ii, p. 114.

for the purpose of establishing connections between these pretended great monarchs and the West, through the mediation of the pope. Not only have we every reason to doubt the truth of these reports, but it is also quite questionable whether the persons who represented themselves as envoys, were really authorized to appear in that character; whether, in fact, the whole is not to be regarded as a work of fraud; especially since we know, that when the crusades had laid open a more free communication betwixt the East and the West, the credulity of the West was often imposed upon by such fraudulent pretensions. Still, we should not be authorized on these grounds to call in question the existence of such a line of sacerdotal kings passing under the common name of John. It is possible, that Nestorians baptized the king, and then gave him priestly consecration; and that at baptism he received the name John, — particularly because this was the name of the Nestorian patriarch at that time. Both name and office may then have passed down to his successors. Occasion may have been given for associating the sacerdotal and kingly offices together in one man by ideas and tendencies already existing in those districts at an earlier period; ideas and tendencies which afterwards reappeared among this people, under another form, in Lamaïsm. In recent times, however, a more careful examination into the history and the relations of the Chinese empire has led to a different interpretation of this story.[1] The kings of Keraït were vassals of the vast Chinese empire; and as such they bore, in addition to their proper names, the character and title of "Vam," or "Vang." Now this latter title, joined with the Tartaric "Khan," gave origin to the name "Vam-Khan," or "Ung-Khan." It is supposed, then, that the legend respecting these kings, who all called themselves John, proceeded from a misconception, or mutilation, of that twofold title; while the legend respecting their uniting the offices of priest and king may have originated in a transfer of religious notions, already current among these nations at an earlier period, into a Christian form. Thus we might be led to regard the whole story concerning the conversion of the princes of Keraït and their subjects, as a legend which originated in misconception and exaggeration, without the least foundation of historical truth. But as the report in the above-mentioned letter of the Nestorian metropolitan, respecting the conversion of that Tartarian prince, is confirmed in all essential points by the narratives of Western missionaries and travellers belonging to the thirteenth century, who had, some of them, long resided in those districts, and were not accustomed to exaggerate; so we regard the statement that princes of Keraït were converted by Nestorians to Christianity, that is, led to the outward profession of it, and to the

[1] Schlosser's Weltgeschichte, iii, ii, 1, s. 269. Ritter's Geographie, ii, ii, Bd. 1, s. 257. Schmidt, in a note contained in the above-mentioned Geschichte der Ostmongolen, s. 283. Gieseler, who adopts this view has endeavored to make this derivation probable, by supposing that the Nestorians confounded the foreign Tartarian words with others of like sound in the Semitic dialects, Jochanan and Chohen; see Studien u. Kritiken, 1837, 2 h. s. 354.

adoption of Christian usages, and that such a Christianity was transmitted in their families, — as a fact sufficiently well established, however uncertain may be the rest of the story.

At all events, an end was put to the empire of these so-called sacerdotal kings, probably under the fourth of the dynasty, by the great revolution in 1202, which, somewhat later, shook not only Asia but Europe. The head of one of the subordinate tribes under this empire, khan Temudschin, revolted. The king of Kerait lost, in the struggle which ensued, his kingdom and his life, and Temudschin became, under the name of Dschingiskhan, founder of the great Mongolian empire. It is said, however, that he married the daughter of the slain priest-king; and that Rabbanta,[1] a Nestorian monk, rose to great authority and influence; but we ought not to attribute too much importance to statements like these. The religious interest, as a general thing, was amongst the Mongols an altogether subordinate concern; their only article of faith was the recognition of one Almighty God, the Creator of the world, and of the great khan, his son, whom he set over all the kingdoms of the world, and whom all must obey. This one fundamental article left room, indeed, for a great deal besides, which might be taken from other quarters, and incorporated with it. The religion of these tribes was a rude monotheism, which took but a slight hold on the religious interest; the belief in one God, who was held off at an immense distance, — a belief affording but little to occupy the thoughts or feelings of the human mind; and into the void thereby left for the religious nature, an entrance was left open for all manner of superstition. The religious need would necessarily strive to fill up the chasm between that sublime and distant Deity, floating before the mind in dim presentiment, and the life of man in all its contraction and feebleness; and it was precisely here that all forms of superstition were enabled to find a foothold. Idols and amulets, fabricated by their own hands, laid stronger hold on the affections and the imaginations of the people, than that vague belief in one God, the creator of the universe. In this manner, it was possible that, under the above-mentioned single article of faith, different religions,[2] that is, their forms and usages, with which a superstitious sort of coquetry was practised, might subsist side by side. Indeed, a frequent change of religious usages was particularly agreeable to the taste of these tribes of men; and thus it happened that Christian, Mohammedan, and Buddhist rites and usages were afterwards admitted amongst them and tolerated together. Nestorian priests long wandered about among these nations; and these people required nothing more than such an adoption of Christian forms, which they represented as an embracing of Christianity. At the

[1] Certainly not a proper name, but a mixture of two titles of honor from different languages, viz.: the Syrian Rabban, and the Turkish Atta, father. See Abel-Remusat in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, t. vi, an. 1822, p. 413.

[2] The J. de Plano Carpini, shortly to be mentioned, makes concerning the Mongols the correct remark: "Quia de cultu Dei nullam legem observant, neminem adhuc, quod intelleximus, coëgerunt suam fidem vel legem negare."

same time, the Mongolian princes, induced by motives of political interest, and seeking to form alliances with Christian nations against the Mohammedans, — often represented themselves as more inclined to Christianity than they really were; or else with a view to flatter the Christian princes of the East, who in a certain sense did them homage, accommodated themselves, in the expression of their religious opinions, to the views of those whom they addressed.

Under Oktaikhan, the successor of Dschingiskhan, the armies of the Mongols threatened to deluge Europe, through Russia, Poland, Bohemia, and Silesia; while the Christian nations were prevented from adopting common measures of defence, by the quarrels between the pope and the emperor Frederic the Second. This led pope Innocent the Fourth to send two embassies to the Mongols, one to charge them, in his name, to desist from their warlike expeditions against the Christian nations, and the other to make an attempt to convert them to Christianity. Both were ill-judged; for of what avail was such an injunction, backed up by nothing else; what signified the word of a pope amongst Mongols? And as to the other object, of gaining them over to Christianity, a single embassy could do nothing towards its accomplishment; while the instruments chosen by the pope for this business, possessed neither the character nor the information necessary for performing the task imposed on them. In the year 1245, four Dominicans are said to have visited the commander-in-chief of the Mongols in Persia, and three Franciscans to have repaired to the great khan himself. The former,[1] at whose head stood the monk Ascelin, were altogether unfitted for the business they undertook, being utterly ignorant both of the manners and of the language of these nations, as well as utterly destitute of the versatility of mind necessary for acquiring such knowledge. Offence was taken, in the first place, because they had not, according to the Oriental custom, brought presents with them. Then, to obtain an audience from the commander-in-chief, it was made a condition that they should pay obeisance to him by three several prostrations. The scruple which they raised, that this would be a mark of idolatrous homage, was removed, it is true, by Guiscard of Cremona, a monk familiar with the manners of the East, whom they met with at Tiflis; and who explained to them that nothing of this kind was associated with the act in the customs of these nations. But when he informed them, at the same time, that it would be a mark of homage paid by the pope and the Church of Rome to the great khan; they declared themselves resolved to die rather than subject the Church of Rome and Christendom to such a disgrace in the sight of the nations of the East. The Tartars looked upon it as exceedingly strange, that, adoring as they did the sign of the cross in wood and stone, they could pay no such mark of respect to the great commander, whom the khan would not hesitate to honor as he did himself. They looked upon this refusal as a serious insult to the

[1] The report of their mission by one of the party, Simon of St. Quintin, set forth in Vincentius de Beauvais, speculum historiale, l. xxxi, c. 40.

dignity of the khan, in his representative; and it was only by a fortunate turn of circumstances that the monks escaped being put to death. Finally, they were required to go and meet the great khan himself, to place in his hands the pope's letter, convince themselves, by their own observation, of his unlimited power and matchless glory, and draw up a report of the same to the pope. To this, Ascelin replied that, as his lord the pope knew nothing about the name of the khan, and had not commanded him to inquire after that personage, but to accost the first army of the Tartars whom he should meet, so he was not bound, and neither was he inclined, to make a journey to the khan. This style of expressing himself with regard to the relation of the pope to the Tartarian monarch, provoked afresh the displeasure of the Tartars. "Has the pope, then," said they, "subdued as many kingdoms and vast empires as the great khan, the son of God? Has the name of the pope spread as widely as that of the great khan, who is feared from the East to the West?" Upon this, Ascelin explained to them, that the pope, as the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ had intrusted the government of the entire church, possessed the highest authority among men. But of such an authority the Tartars could form no conception; and in vain did Ascelin resort to various illustrations and examples for the purpose of making the thing plain to them.[1]

The letter of the pope was then translated first into Persian, thence into the Tartarian language, and placed before the commander-in-chief. And the monks, after being detained for several months, finally obtained permission to go home; and at the same time a brief, haughty reply to the pope's letter, was placed in their hands. It ran thus: "Whereas, it is God's immutable decree, that all who come personally to show their submission to the great khan, whom God has made lord over the whole world, should remain on their own soil and territory, but the rest be destroyed; therefore, let the pope take care to inform himself of this, if he wishes to retain his country." The Franciscans, with whom went Johannes de Plano Carpini, an Italian,[2] directed their course to Tartary, and the great khan, through Russia; and their journey, lying through desolate regions and steppes, which they had to traverse on horseback, often at the greatest speed and without halting, was one attended with the severest deprivations and hardships. These monks seemed to be better qualified for their business than the first: Johannes de Plano Carpini, in particular, by his extensive earlier travels, by the important offices which he had filled in his order, and the superior tact he had thereby acquired, seemed much better prepared for it. Less stiff in their prejudices, they could more easily enter into foreign customs and modes of thinking; and hence showed themselves quite ready to make presents, after the Oriental fashion, of the few articles they brought with them; nor did they hesitate to go through the ceremony of thrice bowing the knee,

[1] Ascelino multis modis et exemplis exponente, illi tanquam brutales homines nullatenus intelligere valuerunt plenarie.

[2] Extracts from his report in Vincentius de Beauvais, lib. 31. The same was first published complete by D'Avezac. Paris, 1838.

as a customary mark of respect to those in power. When they arrived at the khan's court, Oktaikhan had died, and they were present at the coronation of his successor, Gaiuk. They also found here Nestorian priests, who were maintained by the khan, and who performed their worship before his tents. But assuredly it was an exaggeration, intended or unintended, on the part of the Christians in immediate attendance on the khan, when they told the monks, that he himself would soon embrace Christianity.[1] Besides giving them a letter to the pope, he proposed to send back with them envoys of his own; a proposal which, for various prudential reasons, they thought proper to decline. In other respects, this embassy proved as fruitless as the former.

The crusades, in various ways, brought the Christians of the West into contact with the Mongols.[2] The leaders of the Mongols were sometimes induced by motives of policy to court the alliance of the Western princes against their common enemy, the Mohammedans; or they ambitiously affected the distinction of being acknowledged, even by those princes, as their liege lords and masters. There were, however, roving about in the East, many deceivers, who represented themselves as envoys from the Mongols, as well as from others; and, in their names, expressed opinions, and made treaties, such as had never been dreamed of by those rulers. At the same time, however, the Mongol princes themselves, doubtless, contrived that many things should be said in their name, which they afterwards refused to acknowledge as having ever proceeded from them. Thus that pious king, Louis the Ninth of France, while residing, in the time of his crusade, on the isle of Cyprus, heard many exaggerated stories about the inclination of the Mongolian princes to favor Christianity, which induced him to send them ambassadors with presents.

Among these ambassadors, the most distinguished was the Franciscan William de Rubruquis, who undertook a journey of this sort in the year 1253. He visited the Mongol general and prince Sartach, his father Batu, and the great khan of the Mongols himself, the Mangukhan. He penetrated as far as Caracorum, the renowned capital of this empire, the ancient residential city of the above-mentioned priest-kings. From his report of this journey, we discover that he was a man less prone to credulity than other monks of his time, more inclined, and better qualified, to examine into facts; and it is through him, we receive the first certain and accurate information respecting the religious condition of these nations, and respecting their relation

[1] The words of J. de Plano Carpini, in the complete edition of his report, mentioned in the previous note, § xii, p. 370: "Dicebant etiam nobis Christiani, qui erant de familia ejus, quod credebant firmiter, quod debet fieri Christianus et de hoc habent signum apertum, quoniam ipse tenet clericos christianos et dat eis expensas, Christianorum etiam capellam semper habet ante majus tentorium ejus, et cantant publice et aperte, et pulsant ad horas secundum morem Graecorum, ut alii Christiani, quantacunque sit ibi multitudo Tatarorum vel etiam hominum aliorum, quod non faciunt alii duces."

[2] See the Essay of Abel-Rémusat: "Rapports des princes chrétiens avec le grand empire des Mongols," in the Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, t. vi, p. 398 1822.

to Christianity. In piety, and Christian knowledge, he was far superior to the Oriental monks and ecclesiastics, who wandered about among these tribes; and his piety, his intrepidity, and his insight into the essence of Christianity, as viewed from the position held by his own church, fitted him beyond others to act as a missionary among these nations. When he came into those districts, where the kingdom of Prester John once had its seat, he perceived how exaggerated had been the accounts given of that kingdom by the Nestorians.[1] He says that, with the exception of a few Nestorians, there was nobody who knew anything about Prester John. He found the Nestorians widely dispersed in these regions, and filling important posts in the Tartarian court.[2] But of the Nestorian clergy, he gives a very sad account. "They are," he observes, "thoroughly ignorant; and though they repeat the liturgical forms, and possess the sacred books in the Syriac language, they understand nothing about them. They sing like illiterate monks, that have no understanding of Latin. Hence they are all corrupt in their morals, and wicked in their lives; great usurers, and drunken sots. Some of them, who live among the Tartars, keep, like the latter, several wives."[3] It was quite enough for such people, if they could make their mechanical prayers and ceremonies pass current at the Tartarian court, so as to procure for themselves presents, the means of living, and influence. The khan Mangu was accustomed to avail himself of the opportunity furnished by the Christian, Mohammedan, and pagan festivals, to give entertainments. On these occasions, the Nestorian priests first presented themselves in their clerical robes; offered up prayers for the khan, and pronounced a blessing over his cups: next, the Mohammedan priests did the same; last of all came the pagans,[4] by which, perhaps, we are to understand the Buddhist priests; for there are many indications that Buddhism had already spread into these regions; a thing, indeed, which might have taken place, even at a much earlier period, through missions and pilgrimages of the Buddhists, who were quite zealous in spreading the doctrines of their religion.[5] At this court, he met with a poor weaver from Armenia, who called himself a monk,[6] and pretended before the people that he came from Palestine, in obedience to a special divine revelation.[7] By his sanctimonious

[1] He says of Prester John, out of whom he makes a Nestorian priest, who had raised himself to be king: "Les Nestoriens disaient de lui choses merveilleuses, mais beaucoup plus qu'il n'y avait en effet, car c'est la coutume des Nestoriens de ces pays là, de faire un grand bruit de peu de chose, ainsi qu'ils ont fait courir partout le bruit, que Sartach était chrétien, aussi bien que Mangu-Cham et Ken-Cham, à cause seulement, qu'ils font plus d'honneur aux chrétiens, qu'à tous les autres, toutefois il est très-certain, qu'ils ne sont pas chrétiens." See his report in the collection of Bergeron, t. i, c. 19

[2] L. c. p. 31, 60, 67. [3] L. c. c. 28, p. 60.

[4] Rubruquis writes, c. 36, p. 78: "Tant les uns, que les autres suivent sa cour, comme les mouches à miel font les fleurs, car il donne à tous et chacun lui désire toutes sortes de biens et de prospérités, croyant être de ses plus particuliers amis."

[5] Rubruquis says, c. 28, p. 60: "Les prêtres idolâtres de ce pays là portent de grands chapeaux ou coqueluchons *jaunes* et il y a entre eux aussi, ainsi que j'ai oui dire, certains hermites ou anachorites, qui vivent dans les forêts et les montagnes, menant une vie très-surprenante et austère." In which characters we cannot fail to recognize a Buddhist element.

[6] L. c. c. 38. [7] L. c. c. 48, p. 133

airs, his quackery, and boasted wonder-working medicines, this person had contrived to acquire considerable influence and property at the court of the khan, especially among the women.[1] In the city of Caracorum, he saw twelve idol-temples belonging to different nations, two mosques for Mohammedans, and one church. In this Mongol capital he distributed the sacrament of the Supper, on Easter-Day, to a large number of Christians who had met together here from various countries, and were eager to enjoy that means of grace, of which they had long been deprived. To more than sixty persons, moreover, he administered baptism.[2] After having resided for some time at the court, he requested of the great khan a decisive answer to the question, whether he might be permitted to remain in the country as a missionary, or whether he must return home. In consequence of this, on the Sunday before Whitsuntide of the year 1253, he was, in the name of the khan, closely questioned respecting the object for which he had come, by certain officers of the khan's court, among whom were to be found a few Saracens. After he had explained the reasons which had led him to extend his journey so far, he declared that the only object he had in view was to preach the word of God to the Mongols, if they were willing to hear it. He was asked what word of God he proposed to preach to them; for they supposed that by the word of God he meant certain predictions of good fortune, somewhat of the same sort with those with which many of the wandering ecclesiastics and priests were accustomed to flatter them. But he told them, "The word of God is this, Luke 12: 48, 'Unto whomsoever God has given much, of him shall much be required; and unto whomsoever God has intrusted less, of him less shall be required; and he to whom most is intrusted, is also loved most.' Now, on the khan God had bestowed the most ample abundance of good things; for, of all that greatness and might of which he was possessed, he was indebted for nothing to idols; but for all to God, the creator of heaven and earth, who has all the kingdoms of the world in his hands; and on account of men's sins, suffers them to pass over from one nation to another. Therefore, if the khan loved God, nothing would be wanting to him. But, if he conducted otherwise, he might be sure that God would call him to a strict account for everything, even to the last penny." Here, one of the Saracens asked, "Whether there was a man in the world who did not love God?" "He who loves God," replied Rubruquis, "keeps his commandments; and he who does not keep his commandments, does not love him." Upon this they asked him, "Whether he had ever been in heaven, so as to know what God's commandments are?" "No," said he, "but God has communicated them from heaven to men, who sought after that which is good; and he himself came down from heaven, for the purpose of teaching them to all men. In the sacred Scriptures, we have all his words; and we find out by men's works whether they observe them or not." Upon this, they put him the ensnaring question, "Whether he thought that Mangukhan kept God's

[1] L. c. p. 102, 133.

[2] L. c. c. 42, p. 102

commandments, or not?" But he adroitly evaded the dilemma, contriving, while he said nothing but the truth, to avoid uttering a word which could be interpreted to the khan's disadvantage. "He wished, he said, "to lay before the khan himself, if he pleased, all the commandments of God; and then he could judge for himself whether he kept them or not." The next day the khan declared that, whereas there were scattered among his subjects — Christians, Mohammedans, and worshippers of idols, and each party held their own law to be the best; therefore, it was his pleasure that the advocates of the three religions should appear before him, and each hand in a written account of his law; so that, by comparing them together, it might be determined which was the best. "I thanked God," says Rubruquis,[1] "that it had pleased him to touch the khan's heart, and bring him to this good decision. And, since it is written that a servant of the Lord should be no brawler; but gentle, showing meekness to all men, and apt to teach; therefore, I replied, that I was ready to give an account of my Christian faith to any man who required it of me." In the religious conference which followed, Rubruquis showed immediately his great superiority to the Nestorians. The Nestorians proposed that they should commence the disputation with the Mohammedans. But Rubruquis thought it would be much better to begin with the idolaters; inasmuch as the Christians agreed with the Mohammedans in the faith in one God, and could therefore, on this point, make common cause with them against the idolaters. Furthermore, it was the intention of the Nestorians to prove the doctrine of one God, against the idolaters, from Holy Writ. But Rubruquis explained to them the impossibility of effecting anything in that way; for their opponents would deny the authority of the Scriptures; and would oppose to their testimony other authorities. As they had shown themselves so inexpert in these preliminary matters, it was agreed that he should speak first, and in case he were foiled in the argument, they should follow him up and endeavor to better it. On holy eve before Whitsuntide the disputation was held. The khan had previously caused it to be announced, that, on penalty of death to the transgressor, neither party should dare to injure the other, or to excite disturbances. Three secretaries of the khan, a Christian, a Mohammedan, and an idolater, were to preside as umpires over the debate.

Rubruquis endeavored to prove, in opposition to the idolaters, the necessity of recognizing one Almighty God, the creator of all things. They, on the other hand, being addicted to a certain dualism, wished to have the difficulty solved, how evil could possibly proceed from this one God. Rubruquis, however, refused to be drawn into that question; "for," said he, "before men can enter into any discussion respecting the origin of evil, it would be necessary first to settle the question, What *is* evil?" Thus he compelled them to return to the main point. As to the Mohammedans, they evaded the discussion, declaring that they held the law of the Christians, and all that the

[1] L. c. c. 45.

gospel teaches, to be true; and as they acknowledged also one God, whom, in all their prayers, they besought to give them grace to die like the Christians, so they were not inclined to enter into any dispute with them. Perhaps the Mohammedans merely wished that it should not appear before the idolaters as if there were any dispute between the worshippers of one God; and hence chose on the present occasion to lay stress on that alone which they held in common with the Christians. Perhaps Rubruquis put more into their reply than it really contained.

He had already heard that the khan had determined to dismiss him; and in a second audience, on the festival of Whitsuntide, the decision was announced to him: "We, Mongols," said the khan to him at this interview, "believe there is but one God, by whom we live and die, and to whom our hearts are wholly directed." "God give you grace to do so," said Rubruquis, "for, without his grace, it cannot be done." When, by means of his interpreter, the khan gathered the sense of these words, as well as the former could express it, said he, "As God has given many fingers to the hand, so he has appointed different ways of salvation for man. To the Christians he has given the Holy Scriptures, but they do not strictly observe what is prescribed therein; nor can they find it written there that one class should censure others." He asked Rubruquis whether he found that in the Scriptures. He said, "No," and then added, "but I also told you, from the first, that I would enter into controversy with no man." The khan then proceeded: "I say, God gave you the Holy Scriptures, whose commandments you do not keep. But to us he has given our soothsayers:[1] we do whatsoever they prescribe to us, and live in peace with one another." The khan was careful to avoid entering into any farther conversation with Rubruquis, as the latter wished, on religion; but simply made known to him his command, that he should now leave the country, for the purpose of conveying his answer to the letter of king Louis the Ninth. Rubruquis declared his readiness to obey; but at the same time begged that he might be permitted, after having delivered the letters, to return; especially, as in the city of Bolak, there were many of his subjects and servants, who spoke the French language, and who were in want of priests to preach to them, and also to impart to them and to their children the sacraments according to the principles of their religion; and he would be glad to settle among them. The khan, avoiding a direct reply to this request, proposed a query. He asked Rubruquis if he felt certain then, that his king intended to send him back again. To this Rubruquis replied, that he did not know what the king's will might be; but he had perfect liberty from him to go wherever he thought it necessary to preach the word of God; and it seemed to him there was an urgent need of his labors in these countries. The khan dismissed him, however, without a definite answer to his request; and silence here was tantamount to a refusal. Rubruquis concludes his account of this final interview

[1] A sort of people, who pretended to understand soothsaying, astrology, and magic, who were consulted on all affairs of state and directed all religious lustrations.

with the remark, " I thought that, had my God bestowed on me the gift to work such miracles as Moses did, I might perhaps have converted the great khan."

By these Mongols, two great empires were founded, where their government must have had an important influence on the situation of the Christian church. One was the empire founded by the khan's brother, Hulagu, after the year 1258, in *Persia;* the other, the principal Mongol empire in *China*. Within the former, indeed, was the original seat of the Nestorian Church, where it had already been favored by the Mohammedans. The new conqueror was induced by his wife, a Nestorian Christian, to favor Christianity still more. Besides, there were matrimonial alliances of the succeeding princes with the families of the Byzantine emperors, and political interests which brought them into relation with the European princes; and they were sometimes led thereby to represent themselves as still more inclined to Christianity than was really the case. The popes, down to the close of the present period, availed themselves of the opportunity furnished by these relations, to send monks as missionaries to Persia. But the favor thus shown to Christianity excited a jealousy so much the more violent on the part of the Mohammedan class of the people; and a contest arose between them and the Christian party which terminated in a complete victory on the side of the former, and violent persecutions of Christianity.

As it regards the principal empire of the Mongols in China, it is to be remarked that the religion of this people here obtained for the first time a determinate shaping, in the form of Lamaïsm, the creation of a hierarchy which sprang out of Buddhism. The Mongols could not withstand the influence of the elements of culture already existing in that country. Koblaikhan, the founder of this empire, distinguished himself above the earlier Mongol princes as a friend of education. In religion, he seems to have fallen in with a certain eclectic tendency. He had a respect for all religious institutions, and especially for Christianity; though he was very far from being himself a Christian.

His court was visited by two merchants belonging to the Venetian family of the Poli. They were favorably received, and resided with him for some time. He finally sent them back to Europe, in company with a man of his own court, with a commission to procure for him, from the pope, a hundred learned men, who should be well instructed in Christianity; but their return from Rome was delayed by the two years vacancy which befell the papal chair in 1272. Gregory the Tenth having been elected pope in 1274, sent them back to China, with two learned Dominicans; and one of the two Venetians took with him his son Marcus, then fifteen years old. The young man made himself accurately acquainted with the languages and customs of those nations; he gained the particular favor of Koblaikhan, was employed by him on various occasions, and after his return, in 1295,[1] composed his account of these regions, from which we obtain our best knowledge

[1] De regionibus orientalibus, libri iii.

respecting the state of Christianity in the same. A person who professed to be a Christian (probably after the Nestorian fashion) had rebelled against Koblaikhan. He mounted the cross on his banner, and moreover employed several Christians in his service. The Jews and Saracens in the army of Koblaikhan, took occasion from this, after that rebel had been conquered, to attack Christianity: "Here," said they, "is seen the weakness of Christ. He could not procure his friends the victory." But Koblaikhan, when the Christians complained to him of these reflections, took their part. "It is true," said he, "the rebel did look for aid to the Christian's God; but He, being a good and righteous God, would not uphold wickedness;" and he forbade, for the future, all such calumnious remarks on the God of the Christians, and on the cross.[1]

At the close of the thirteenth century, and in the beginning of the fourteenth, a man labored in these districts, in whom we recognize the pattern of a true missionary,— the Franciscan, John de Monte Corvino. He seems to have appeared first in Persia, in the city of Tauris (Tabris). From Persia he travelled, in the year 1291, to India,[2] where he remained thirteen months. He was accompanied by the Dominican Nicholas de Pistorio, who died there. In different districts, he succeeded in baptizing a hundred persons; and in the second letter which he wrote to Europe, he declared it as his belief, that "great results might be expected to follow the preaching of the gospel in those regions, if substantial men of the order of the Dominicans or Franciscans would come there." From India he travelled to China; and at length settled down in the capital and residence of the great khan, the city of Cambalu (Pekin). In two letters written in the years 1305 and 1306, he drew up, for the members of his order, a brief report of his adventures and labors.[3] During eleven years he had labored entirely alone, when he was joined, in the year 1303, by Arnold, a Franciscan from Cologne. In addition to other obstacles he had to encounter much opposition from the Nestorians, who would not suffer any man to move a step if he refused to join their party. They invented many false charges against him, which were often the means of bringing him into great peril. He was frequently obliged to defend himself before the courts, till at length, by one confession, his innocence was clearly proved; and the khan (Koblai's successor, Timur-khan), provoked at his false accusers, punished them with banishment. He found that it was not in his power, indeed, to convert the Chinese emperor, to whom he brought a letter from the pope; but still that potentate treated him with favor, and did the Christians many acts of kindness.[4]

This distinguished man, displaying the wisdom of a genuine missionary, spared no pains in giving the people the word of God in their

[1] See Marco Polo, lib. ii, c. 6.

[2] Regiones sunt pulcherrimae, plenae aromatibus et lapidibus pretiosis, sed de fructibus nostris parum habent.

[3] First published in Wadding's Annals. t. vi; then in Mosheim's historia eccles. Tartaror.

[4] Qui tamen nimis inveteratus est idolatria, sed multa beneficia praestat Christianis.

own language, and in encouraging the education of the children, as well as training up missionaries from among the people themselves. He translated the New Testament and the Psalms into the Tartar language, had these translations copied in the most beautiful style, and made use of them in preaching.[1] He purchased, one at a time, a hundred and fifty boys, under the ages of seven and eleven, who were as yet utterly ignorant of any religion; baptized them; gave them a Christian education, and taught them Latin, Greek, and psalmody. Already during the first years of his residence in Cambalu, he was enabled to build a church, in which, with the assistance of those boys who had been trained up by himself, he recited the liturgy, so that he could truly say, "I hold divine service with a troop of babes and sucklings."[2] In this church he set up six pictures, representing stories from the Old and New Testaments, together with explanatory remarks in the Latin, Persian, and Tartar languages, for the instruction of the uneducated people.[3] It gave him great satisfaction when he found it in his power to erect a second church in the vicinity of the emperor's palace. A rich and pious Christian merchant, whose acquaintance he had formed in Persia, Peter de Lucalongo, purchased a piece of property on this site, and made him a present of it. This church, which he built in the year 1305, stood so near the walls of the palace,[4] that the emperor in his private cabinet could hear the church psalmody;[5] and the emperor took great delight in the singing of children. Monte Corvino now divided the boys between the two churches. He had, during his residence in this place, baptized from five to six thousand; and he believed that, had it not been for the many plots laid against him by the Nestorians, he would have succeeded in baptizing above thirty thousand. In the first years of his residence in that place, he met with a certain prince, George, a descendant of the priest-kings. This person was persuaded by him to pass over from the Nestorian to the Catholic church. He conferred on him the inferior ecclesiastical consecration; after which, the prince assisted him, dressed in his royal robes, in performing divine worship. This prince had induced a large portion of his people to embrace the faith of the Catholic church, had built a magnificent church, and caused it to be called after a Roman name. It had also been his intention to translate the whole Roman liturgy into the language of his people, and introduce it into his church; but he died in the year 1299, too early to accomplish his design. He left behind him a son, still lying in the cradle. This son was baptized by Monte Corvino, who, as his god-father, called him after his own name, John.

[1] Quae feci scribi in pulcherrima litera eorum, et scribo et lego et praedico in patenti et manifesto testimonium legis Christi.

[2] Cum conventu infantium et lactentium divinum officium facio. Practice had to supply the place of a breviary provided with notes. Et secundum usum cantamus, quia notatum officium non habemus.

[3] Ad doctrinam rudium, ut omnes linguae legere valeant.

[4] Inter curiam et locum nostrum via sola est, distans per jactum lapidis a porta Domini Chamis.

[5] In camera sua potest audire voces nostras, et hoc mirabile factum longe lateque divulgatum est inter gentes et pro magno erit, sicut disponet et adimplebit divina clementia.

But the Nestorians now succeeded in once more obtaining the mastery in this country; and all that had been done by Monte Corvino in the interest of the Catholic church, fell to the ground. "Being alone," he wrote, "and not permitted to leave the emperor, it was out of my power to visit churches situated at a distance of twenty-days journey; nevertheless, if a few good helpers and fellow-laborers should come, I hope in God, that all our hopes will be made good, for I still retain the privilegium given me by the deceased king George." For two years he had had access to the emperor's court, and as papal legate, was more honored by him than any other ecclesiastic.[1] He was convinced, that with two or three more assistants to stand by him, he might have succeeded in baptizing the emperor himself. In his two letters he urgently begged for such assistants, but they should be brethren, who would seek to stand forth as examples, and not to make broad their phylacteries. Matthew, 23: 5. "I am already become old," says he, in one of those letters, "but I have grown grey by labors and hardships, rather than by the number of my years, for I have lived but fifty-eight years." The pope made this excellent man archbishop of Cambalu, and sent seven other Franciscans to assist him in his labors.

The crusades promoted intercourse between the East and the West, but the connection thus brought about between the Mohammedan and Christian races was not of such a kind as to prepare the way for the exertion of any religious influence on the former; although that which Mohammedanism had already borrowed from Judaism and Christianity, as well as the intrinsic contradictions contained within itself, might have furnished the means and occasions for such an influence. Moreover, the vicious lives of a large portion of those who were led to the East by the crusades, were but poorly calculated to produce on Mohammedans a favorable impression of the religion which these men professed. But it is apparent from individual examples, how much *might* have been effected here by the gospel if it had been preached with Christian enthusiasm, and illustrated by holy living. When a Christian army, in the year 1219, was besieging the city of Damietta (not far from the present Damietta),[2] in Egypt, Francis of Assisi,[3] stood forth in that army as a preacher of repentance, and from thence he was impelled by his burning zeal, to go over to the Mohammedan army, which had arrived for the relief of the city. He was dragged as a captive before Malek al Kamel, the sultan of Egypt. The sultan, however, received him with respect, allowed him to preach several successive days before himself and his officers, and heard him with great attention. He then sent him back, in the most honorable manner, to the camp of the Franks, saying to him, as he took leave, "Pray for me, that God may enlighten me, and enable

[1] Ego habeo in curia sua locum et viam ordinariam intrandi et sedendi sicut legatus Domini Papae, et honorat me super omnes alios praelatos, quocunque nomine censeatur.

[2] See Wilken's Geschichte der Kreuzzüge Bd. vi, p. 186.

[3] Of whom we shall speak more at large farther on.

me to hold firmly to that religion which is most pleasing to him." This story we have from an eye-witness, Jacob de Vitry,[1] bishop of Acco (Ptolemais, St. Jean d'Acre), in Palestine, afterwards cardinal, who was then present in the army there assembled.[2] In a letter written immediately after the capture of Damietta, in which he drew up for the regular canonicals of Liege, to which order he once belonged, a report of that important event, he gives at the same time this account of the labors of Francis.[3] He also states, as an eye-witness, that the Mohammedans gladly listened to missionaries of the Franciscan order, when they spoke of the Christian faith, as long as they refrained from reviling Mohammed as a false prophet. But no sooner did they fall into such abuse than they exposed themselves to be severely treated, and even to lose their lives, and were driven away.[4] Had they, then, united to their glowing zeal, a prudent

[1] De Vitriaco.

[2] See his Historia occidentalis, c. 32. Bonaventura, in his Life of St. Francis, c. 9, relates that, in the thirteenth year after his conversion, which would coincide very nearly with the time mentioned in the text, Francis went to Syria, for the purpose of visiting the sultan of Babylon, not fearing the danger, although at that time the price of a gold Byzantine was set upon the head of every Christian. When he was led before the sultan, he spoke with such power, that the sultan was carried completely away by him, heard him with the greatest pleasure, and requested him to remain longer with him. Thereupon, Francis said to him, that if he and his people would embrace Christianity, he would gladly consent, from love of the Saviour his Master, to remain with him. But if he could not consent to this, then he might order a large fire to be kindled; into this he (Francis) would enter, along with the Mohammedan priests; and so it would be determined by a judgment of God on which side the true faith was to be found. The sultan objected that none of *his* priests would be ready for that. Whereupon, Francis declared, if the sultan would promise him that he with his people would embrace Christianity in case he should come forth unharmed from the flames, he would enter the fire alone; though, should he be devoured by them, it must be ascribed to his sins; but if the power of God delivered him, then they must recognize Christ as their God and Saviour. The sultan declared he could not venture to accept such a proposal for fear of an uproar amongst the people. He offered Francis, however, many presents, and upon his declining to receive them, requested him to distribute them, for the salvation of the donor's soul, amongst the Christian poor and the churches; but he refused to take them even for this purpose. Something similar is related also by the disciple of Francis, Thomas de Celano, in his Life of St. Francis, s. 57. Acta Sanctor. Mens. Octob. t. ii, f. 699. It is hardly to be doubted, that the same event is here alluded to which Jacob de Vitry relates, the scene only being transferred from Egypt to Syria, and in place of the sultan of Egypt the sultan of Babylon introduced, by which doubtless is meant the sultan of Damascus, Malek al Moaddhem Isa, a fierce enemy of the Christians; which substitution of persons might the more easily occur, because that sultan also had been to Egypt. The more simple and exact account of the eye-witness is certainly the most trustworthy. The two others, enthusiastic admirers of St. Francis, followed more exaggerated and inaccurate legends. The appeal to a judgment of God is undoubtedly in the spirit of Francis, and the sultan might perhaps have returned such an answer to it. At all events, the agreement of the three accounts in the essential point, vouches for the truth of the fact lying at bottom.

[3] Epistola Jacobi Acconensis episcopi missa ad religiosos, familiares et notos suos in Lotharingia existentes, de captione Damiatae. Here he at last says of Francis "Cum venisset ad exercitum nostrum, zelo fidei accensus, ad exercitum hostium nostrorum ire non timuit et cum multis diebus Saracenis verbum Domini praedicasset, et cum parum profecisset, tunc Soldanus Rex Aegypti ab eo in secreto petiit, ut pro se Domino supplicaret, quatenus religioni, quae magis Deo placeret, divinitus inspiratus adhaereret" Vid. Gesta Dei per Francos, ed. Bongars. t. ii, f. 1149.

[4] The words of J. de Vitry in the Hist. occident. l. c.: "Saraceni autem omnes fratres minores tam diu de Christi fide et evangelica doctrina praedicantes libenter audiunt, quousque Mahometo, tanquam mendaci et perfido, praedicatione sua manifeste contradicunt. Ex tunc autem eos

spirit; had they been able to abstain a while longer from rash polemical disputes; their preaching would perhaps have been followed with happier results.

Among the rare phenomena in the history of missions, may be reckoned the combination of a scientific spirit with earnest zeal for the cause of Christ; the appropriation of science as a means for promoting the spread of the gospel, as an instrument for attacking, on its own chosen grounds, some other form of culture standing in hostility to Christianity. The example of the great Alexandrian church-teachers, who had in this way done so much for the overthrow of that Hellenic culture which furnished a prop for paganism, was forgotten or remained unnoticed. Nor was there any call for this method among rude tribes, where it could find no application. But there could be no question about the advantage of employing it for the promotion of missions in those parts where Christianity, in order to find entrance into the minds of a people, must first enter into the contest with some existing culture closely inwoven with a hostile system of religion. We close this history of missions with an account of the labor of an extraordinary individual who, by employing a method of this kind, takes a prominent and peculiar place among the missionaries of this period, and constitutes an epoch in the history of missions generally, — a man distinguished for combining, though he may not have conciliated into harmonious union, moral and intellectual traits very different in their kind, and seldom meeting together in the same person; we mean Raymund Lull, who was born in the island of Majorca, in 1236.

Until the age of thirty, he had lived wholly to the world. A stranger to all higher aspirations, he resided at the court of the king of the Balearian islands, where he occupied the post of seneschal. Even after his marriage, he continued to pursue pleasures not altogether consistent with conjugal fidelity; and the theme of his poetical compositions was sensual love. But that feeling of Christian piety which, as it moved his age and the people among whom he lived, had been instilled also by education into his early affections, and that not without success, brought on a reaction against the hitherto-governing principle of his life. One night, whilst sitting by his bed, occupied in composing a love-sonnet, the image of Christ on the cross all at once presented itself before his eyes. It made so powerful an impression on him, that he could write no farther. At another time, when he attempted to resume his pen, the same image reappeared, and he was obliged to desist, as before.[1] Day and night this image floated before his fancy; nor could he find

impie verberantes, et nisi Deus mirabiliter protegeret paene trucidantes, de civitatibus suis expellunt."

[1] We here follow the treatise relating to a portion of the life of Raymund Lull, which was composed, while Lull was still living, by a man who, as it seems, was accurately acquainted with his subject, — perhaps the companion of his missionary journeys; — published in the Actis Sanctorum, at the 31st of June; Mens. Jun. t. v, f. 661. More recent accounts (see Wadding's Annales Franciscan. t. iv, an. 1275, § 4) state, that an unfortunate love affair with a lady who was married, and suffering under a cancerous affection, was the first occasion of the change in his religious feelings. As, however, the trustworthy narrative of the unknown writer just referred to mentions nothing of the kind, and we do not know from what source this account was derived, it remains, to say the least, doubtful.

any means of resisting the impression it made on him. Finally, he looked upon these visions as sent for the purpose of warning him to retire from the world, and to consecrate himself wholly to the service of Christ. But now the question occurred to him, "How can I possibly make the change from the impure life I have led, to so holy a calling?" This thought kept him awake whole nights. At last, said he to himself, "Christ is so gentle, so patient, so compassionate; — he invites all sinners to himself; therefore he will not reject *me*, notwithstanding all my sins." Thus he became convinced it was God's will, that he should forsake the world and consecrate himself, with his whole heart, to the service of Christ. When this new life, this life animated by the love of God and the Saviour, began to dawn within him, from that moment he was conscious, for the first time, of a new elevation imparted to his whole being. The latent powers of this extraordinary mind, now first stirred in its depths, powers which had hitherto lain dormant, began to discover themselves. The man of warm and excitable feelings, of quick and lively imagination, could now find pleasure in the dry forms of logic; but we must allow that this fertile imagination could bring so much the more meaning into those empty logical forms. And all, in his case, proceeded from that one religious idea, which from this time forward actuated his whole life, gave direction to all his plans, and by which the most heterogeneous aims and endeavors were united together.

Being now resolved to consecrate himself entirely to the service of the Lord, he next pondered upon the best method of carrying this resolution into effect; and he came to a settled conviction that to the Lord Christ no work of his could be more acceptable than that of devoting himself to the preaching of the gospel; in doing which his thoughts were directed particularly to the Saracens, whom the crusaders had attempted in vain to subdue by the sword. But now a great difficulty arose: how could he, an ignorant layman, be fit for such a work? While perplexed in laboring to resolve this difficulty, the thought suddenly occurred to him, that he might write a book serving to demonstrate the truth of Christianity in opposition to all the errors of the infidels; and with this thought, was afterwards connected the idea of a universal system of science. The whole suggestion rose up with such strength in his soul that he felt constrained to recognize it as a divine call. Nevertheless, he reasoned with himself, even supposing he were able to write such a book, of what use would it be to the Saracens, who understood nothing but Arabic? Thus the project began already to unfold itself in his mind, of applying to the pope and to the monarchs of Christendom, calling upon them to establish in certain monasteries foundations for studying and acquiring the Arabic tongue, as well as other languages, spoken amongst infidel nations. From such establishments missionaries might go forth to all regions. Thus he came upon the idea of founding linguistic schools for missionary purposes. The day after these thoughts occurred to him, and took so deep hold of his mind, he repaired to a neighboring church, where with warm tears he besought the Lord, that he, who by

his own Spirit had inspired these three thoughts within him, would now lead him on to the execution of the contemplated work in defence of Christianity, to the establishing of those schools for missions and the study of the languages, and finally to the entire dedication of his life to the cause of the Lord. This took place in the beginning of the month of July; but it was not all at once that this new and higher direction of life could gain the absolute ascendency in his soul. Old habits were still too strong; and so it happened that, during the space of three months, Raymond Lull ceased to occupy himself any longer with these thoughts upon which he had so eagerly seized at first. Then came the fourth of October, dedicated to the memory of St. Francis; and in the Franciscan church at Majorca, he heard a bishop preach on St. Francis's renunciation of the world. By this sermon his holy resolutions were again called to mind. He resolved to follow at once the example of St. Francis. Selling his property, of which he retained only as much as sufficed for the support of his wife and children, he gave himself up wholly to the Lord Christ, and left his home with the intention of never returning back to it. His next step was to make pilgrimages to several churches then standing in high consideration, for the purpose of imploring God's blessing, and the intercession of the saints, that he might be enabled to carry out the three thoughts which had been suggested to him in so remarkable a manner.

He now proposed going to Paris, for the purpose of qualifying himself by a course of scientific studies for the accomplishment of his plans; but through the influence of his kinsmen and friends, particularly of that famous canonist, the Dominican Raymund de Pennaforte, he was dissuaded from this project. Remaining therefore in Majorca, he there began his studies, having first exchanged the rich attire belonging to his former station in life, for a coarser dress. Purchasing a Saracen slave, he made him his instructor in Arabic; and we cannot but admire the energy and resolution of the man, who, after having spent so many years of his life in society and pursuits of so entirely different a nature, and certainly never applied the powers of his mind to severe thought, could throw himself, at so late a period, into the midst of the driest dialectical studies, and even take delight in them.

At first, Raymund Lull diligently employed himself in tracing the leading outlines of a universal formal science. This was his *Ars major*, or *generalis*, designed as the preparatory work to a strictly scientific demonstration of all the truths of Christianity. We perceive in it, how the religious, and especially the apologetical, interest gave direction to all his thoughts, and how closely he kept his eye fixed on this *one* object, even when moving in the driest tracts of formalism. He was for founding a science, by means of which Christianity might be demonstrated with strict necessity, so that every reasonable mind would be forced to admit its truth. Perhaps he might be flattering himself that a certain means would thus be secured for converting all unbelievers, particularly those whom he chiefly had in view, the Mohammedans, who were wrapped up in the prejudices of their Arabian philosophy. "If he but succeeded," he thought, "in refuting all their

objections to Christianity, then, since they would not be able to refute the arguments which he could bring in defence of Christian truth, their learned men and sages must of necessity embrace Christianity."[1]

There were two parties, against whom, from the vantage-ground of his much-promising science, he zealously contended: on the one side, against those who looked upon such a science as derogatory to faith, which by the very act of renouncing every attempt to comprehend, preserved its self-denying character and had its merit;[2] on the other, against those who, perverted by the influence of a skeptically inclined Arabian philosophy, took advantage of the supposed opposition between philosophical and theological truth, and while they hypocritically pretended that reason was led captive to obedience of the faith, propagated their dogmas, which were opposed to Christianity and to the doctrine of the church, as philosophical truth. He maintained against such, that although faith proceeded first from a practical root, from the bent of will towards the things of God, and although what was thus appropriated became a source of nourishment and strength to the heart;[3] yet having this faith, Christians were then required to soar by means of it to a loftier position, so as to attain a knowledge of the solid groundwork, the necessary truths upon which faith reposes; so that what had been, at first, only a source of nourishment to the heart, would then prove a source of nourishment also to the intellect.[4] The intellect would always be accompanied in its investigations by faith; strengthened by that, and emboldened to attempt higher flights, it would continually mount upward, while faith would keep equal step, and ever make increase with the advance of knowledge.[5] It is remarkable that two men of so different a stamp, and both so original, Abelard,[6] the man of sober understanding in the twelfth century, and Raymund Lull, who combined logical acumen with a profound mysticism and the warm glow of religious sentiment, in the thirteenth century, should in like manner defend the position of science over against that of faith standing alone. In Lull, however, it was the enthusiastic hope of finding a method of argumentation suited to convince all unbelievers of the truth of Christianity, which constituted the moving spring of his philosophical inquiries.

As he believed it was by a divine suggestion, he was first impelled

[1] In the Introductio to the necessaria demonstratio articulorum fidei, he says: "Rogat Raymundus religiosos et seculares sapientes, ut videant, si rationes, quas ipse facit contra Saracenos approbando fidem Catholicam habeant veritatem, quia si forte aliquis solveret rationes, quae per Saracenos contra fidem Catholicam opponuntur, cum tamen ipsi rationes, quae fiunt pro eadem, solvere non valerent, fortificati Saraceni valde literati et sapientes se facerent Christianos."

[2] Dicunt, quod fides non habet meritum, cujus humana ratio praebet experimentum et ideo dicunt, quod non est bonum, probare fidem, ut non amittatur meritum. Asserentes autem i ta et dogmatizantes, quanquam magnos se reputent, et quod pejus est ab aliis reputentur, ostendunt se manifestissime ignorantes.

[3] Ipsa fides, quae voluntatis firmiter eam credentium erat pabulum et fomentum.

[4] Fides fundamenta, quibus innititur, necessarias scilicet rationes, ministrabit iisdem, ut sint eorum pabulum intellectus.

[5] Ipsa fides intellectum in se ipsa fundans eumque investigando continue concomitans et consortans supra intellectus vires et potentiam excandescit, quia fatigari nesciens semper nititur intensius et altius ad credendum, propter quod fides in altius erigitur et meritum credentium ampliatur.

[6] See regarding him on a future page

to search after a method capable of guiding all to a conviction of the truth of Christianity; so it was in the solemn hour of devotion that the light first burst in upon him, and disclosed the way in which he might conduct his search with success. He had retired, for eight days, to a mountain, in order that he might there devote himself without disturbance to prayer and meditation. While he was in this solitude, the idea of the above-mentioned Ars generalis burst all at once in a clear light upon his soul. Leaving the mountain, he repaired to another spot, and drew out a sketch of the work according to that idea, which he looked upon as a divine revelation. After this, he returned to the mountain; and on the spot where the light first broke in upon his mind, settled himself down as an anchorite, spending above four months there, praying to God night and day, that he would employ him, together with the Ars generalis which had there been revealed to him, for his own glory and for the advancement of his kingdom. He published his discovery at Montpellier and at Paris; he delivered lectures on the Ars generalis; he translated the work himself into Arabic. His labors in this way extended through a period of nine years. Next, in the year 1275, he prevailed on Jacob, king of the islands Majorca and Minorca, to found on the former of these islands a monastery for the express purpose of constantly supporting in it thirteen Franciscan monks who were to be instructed in the Arabic language, with a view to labor as missionaries amongst the Saracens. In 1286, he went to Rome for the purpose of persuading pope Honorius the Fourth to approve his plan of establishing such missionary schools in the monasteries everywhere; but when he arrived, that pope was no longer living, and the papal chair was vacant. A second visit to Rome on the same errand was attended with no better success.

Finding that he could not establish, as he wished, a plan of united effort for the promotion of this holy enterprise, he now felt constrained to embark in it by himself, and proceed wholly alone, as a missionary among the infidels. For this purpose he repaired, in the year 1287, to Genoa, and engaged his passage in a ship bound to North Africa. As a great deal had already been heard about the remarkable change which Raymund Lull had experienced, about his ardent zeal to effect the conversion of the infidels, and about the new method of conversion which, in his own opinion, promised such magnificent results; so his project, when it became known in Genoa, excited great expectations. The ship in which Raymund was to embark, lay ready for the voyage, and his books had been conveyed on board, when his glowing imagination pictured before him, in such lively and terrible colors, the fate which awaited him among the Mohammedans, whether it was to be death by torture or life-long imprisonment, that he could not summon courage enough to go on board. But no sooner had this passed over, than he was visited with remorseful pangs of conscience, to think that he should prove recreant to the holy purpose with which God had inspired him, and occasion such scandal to believers in Genoa; and a severe fit of fever was the consequence of these inward conflicts.

While in this state of bodily and mental suffering, he happened to hear of a ship lying in port, which was on the point of starting on a voyage to Tunis; and though in a condition seemingly nearer to death than to life, he caused himself to be conveyed on board with his books. His friends, however, believing he could not possibly stand out the voyage in such a condition, and full of anxiety, insisted on his being brought back. But he grew no better, for the cause of his illness was mental. Sometime afterwards, hearing of another ship bound to Tunis, nothing could hinder him now from taking measures to be conveyed on board; and no sooner had the ship got to sea, than he felt himself relieved of the heavy burden which oppressed his conscience; the peace he formerly enjoyed once more returned;[1] for he found himself in his proper element. He was engaged in fulfilling the duty, which he recognized as obligatory on him by the divine calling. With the health of his soul, that of the body was soon restored; and to the astonishment of all his fellow-passengers, he felt himself, after a few days, as well as he had ever been in any former part of his life.

Raymund arrived at Tunis, near the close of the year 1291 or the beginning of the year 1292, and immediately inviting together the learned scholars among the Mohammedans, explained to them how he had come for the purpose of instituting a comparison between Christianity, of which he possessed an accurate knowledge, as well as of all the arguments employed to defend it, and Mohammedanism; and if he found the reasons to be stronger on the side of the doctrines of Mohammed, he was ready to embrace them. The learned Mohammedans now came around him in constantly increasing numbers, hoping that they should be able to convert him to Mohammedanism. After he had endeavored to refute the arguments which they brought forward in defence of their religion, said he to them, "Every wise man must acknowledge that to be the true religion which ascribes to God the greatest perfection, which gives the most befitting conception of each single divine attribute, and which most fully demonstrates the equality and harmony subsisting among them all." He then sought to prove that without the doctrine of the trinity, and of the incarnation of the Son of God, men cannot understand the perfection of God, and the harmony between his attributes.[2] Thus he would prove to them that Christianity is the only religion conformable to reason.

One of the learned Saracens, more fanatically disposed than the rest, directed the attention of the king to the danger threatened to the Mohammedan faith, by Raymund's zeal for making converts; and proposed that he should be punished with death. Raymund was thrown into prison; and already it was determined that he should be put to death, when one of their learned men, possessed of fewer

[1] The unknown author of his Life finely remarks: "Sospitatem conscientiae, quam sub nubilatione supradicta se crediderat amisisse, subito laetus in Domino Sancti Spiritus illustratione misericordi recuperavit una cum sui corporis languidi sospitate."

[2] The arguments by which he supposed that he had demonstrated this, we cannot stop to explain till we come to the section which treats of doctrines.

prejudices, and more wisdom than the others, interceded in his behalf. He spoke of the respect due to the intellectual ability of the stranger, and remarked; that "as they would praise the zeal of a Mohammedan, who should go among the Christians for the purpose of converting them to the true faith; so they could not but honor in a Christian, the same zeal for the spread of that religion, which appeared to him to be the true one." These representations had their effect so far as to save Raymund's life; and he was only condemned to banishment from the country. On leaving the prison, he was obliged to endure many insults from the fanatical populace. He was then placed on board the same Genoese vessel in which he had arrived, and which was now about to depart; and at the same time he was informed, that if he ever let himself be seen again in the territory of Tunis, he should be stoned to death. As he hoped, however, by persevering efforts to succeed in converting many of the learned Saracens with whom he had disputed; he could not prevail upon himself, with the earnest desire he felt for their salvation, to abandon this hope quite so soon. Life was not too dear to him to be sacrificed for such an object. Letting the vessel on board which he had been placed sail off without him, he transferred himself to another, from which he sought a chance of getting into Tunis again unobserved. While remaining in this dangerous concealment, in the harbor of Tunis, he enjoyed sufficient composure to labor on a work connected with his system of the Universal Science.[1] Having tarried here three months without effecting his main object, he finally sailed off with the vessel, and proceeded to Naples. Here he loitered several years, delivering lectures on his new system; till the fame of the pious anchorite, who had lately become pope, under the name of Coelestin the Fifth, inspired in him the hope of being able at length, to carry into effect the plan for promoting missionary enterprises, on which his heart had so long been set. But Coelestin's reign was too short to permit this; and his successor Boniface the Eighth, possessed but little susceptibility to religious ideas and interests.

During his residence at that time in Rome, in the year 1296, he composed the work previously mentioned, on page 63, in which he sought to show, how all the truths of the Christian faith could be proved by incontestable arguments. In the concluding sentences of this work he expresses that enthusiastic zeal for the spread of the Christian faith, which had moved him to compose it. "Let Christians," says he, "consumed with a burning love for the cause of faith, but consider that since nothing has power to withstand *the truth*, which by the strength of arguments is mighty over all things, they can, with God's help and by his might, bring back the infidels to the way of faith; so that the precious name of our Lord Jesus, which is in most regions of the world still unknown to the majority of men, may be proclaimed and adored; and this way of converting infidels, is

[1] In the month of September, 1292, he commenced writing, in the port of Tunis, his Tabula generalis ad omnes scientias applicabilis, as he himself states. See the Commentarius praevius to his life, in the Actis sanct. Mens Jun. t. v, f. 645

easier than all others. For, to the infidels, it seems a difficult and dangerous thing, to abandon their own belief, for the sake of another; but it will be impossible for them not to abandon the faith which is proved to them to be false and self-contradictory, for the sake of that which is true and necessary." And he concludes with these words of exhortation: "With bowed knee and in all humility, we pray that all may be induced to adopt this method; since of all methods for the conversion of infidels, and the recovery of the promised land, this is the easiest and the one most in accordance with Christian charity. As the weapons of the Spirit are far mightier than carnal weapons, so is this method of conversion far mightier than all others." It was on the holy eve before the festival of John the Baptist, that he wrote the above; and hence he added: "As my book was finished on the vigils of John the Baptist, who was the herald of the light, and with his finger pointed to him who is the true light: so may it please our Lord Jesus Christ to kindle a new light of the world, which may guide unbelievers to their conversion; that they with us may go forth to meet the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and praise, world without end."

Being repulsed at Rome, he endeavored, for a series of years, to labor wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. He went to the isle of Cyprus, and from thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Oriental church to orthodoxy. All this he undertook by himself, attended only by a single companion, without ever being able to obtain the wished for support from the more powerful and influential men of the church. In the intervals, he delivered lectures on his system in Italian and French universities, and composed many new treatises.[1]

Between the years 1306 and 1307, he made another journey to North Africa, where he visited the city of Bugia, which was then the seat of the Mohammedan empire. He stood forth publicly and proclaimed in the Arabic language, "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false: and this, he was ready to prove to every one." A vast concourse of people collected around him, and he addressed the multitude in an exhortatory discourse. Already many were about to lay hands on him, intending to stone him to death; when the mufti, who heard of it, caused him to be torn away from the multitude, and brought into his presence. The mufti asked him, how he could act so madly, as to stand forth publicly in opposition to the doctrines of Mohammed; whether he was not aware that, by the laws of the land, he deserved the punishment of death? Raymund replied: "A true servant of Christ, who has experienced the truth of the Catholic faith, ought not to be appalled by the fear of death, when he may lead souls to salvation." The mufti, who was a man well versed in the Arabian philosophy, then challenged him to produce his proofs of Christianity as

[1] It is to be regretted that only a small portion of his works has ever been published, and it is difficult to obtain much of what is published.

opposed to Mohammedanism. Then Raymund sought to convince him that without the doctrine of the trinity, the self-sufficiency, the goodness and love of God, could not be rightly understood; that if that doctrine be excluded, the Divine perfections must be made to depend on that creation which had a beginning in time. The goodness of God cannot be conceived as inactive, said he, — but if you do not adopt the doctrine of the trinity, you must say, that till the beginning of the creation God's goodness was inactive, and consequently was not so perfect.[1] To the essence of the highest good, belongs self-communication; but this can be understood as a perfect and eternal act, only in the doctrine of the trinity. Upon this, he was thrown into a narrow dungeon; the intercession of merchants from Genoa and Spain procured for him, it is true, some alleviation of his condition; yet he remained a close prisoner for half a year. Meanwhile, many attempts were made to convert him to Moslemism. The highest honors and great riches were promised him, on condition that he would change his religion; but, to all these advances, he replied: "And I promise *you*, if you will forsake this false religion, and believe in Jesus Christ, the greatest riches and everlasting life." It was finally agreed, at the proposal of Raymund, that a book should be written on both sides, in proof of the religion which each party professed, when it would appear evident, from the arguments adduced, which had gained the victory. While Raymund was busily employed in composing such a work, a command was issued by the king, that he should be put on board a ship and sent out of the country.[2]

The ship in which he sailed was cast away, in a violent storm, on the coast not far from Pisa. Part of those on board perished in the waves: Raymund, with his companion, was saved. He was received at Pisa with great honors, and after having passed through so many

[1] Tu dicis, quod Deus est perfecte bonus ab aeterno et in aeternum, ergo non indiget mendicare et facere bonum extra se.

[2] We have from Raymund himself a brief notice of these occurrences in the liber, qui est disputatio Raymundi Christiani et Hamar Saraceni; at the end of which book it is stated that it was finished at Pisa, in the monastery of St. Dominick, in April, A. D. 1308. It was the Saracen Hamar, who, with several others, visited him in the dungeon at Bugia, and disputed with him concerning the advantages of Christianity and Mohammedanism. He says, near the close of this work, "Postquam Hamar Saracenus recesserat, Raymundus Christianus posuit in Arabico praedictas rationes, et facto libro, misit episcopo Bugiae (the person at the head of the Mohammedan cultus) rogando, ut sui sapientes viderent hunc librum, et ei responderent. Sed post paucos dies episcopus praecepit, quod praedictus Christianus ejiceretur e terra Bugia et in continenti Saraceni miserunt ipsum in quandam navem, tendentem Genuam, quae navis cum magna fortuna venit ante portum Pisanum et prope ipsum per decem milliaria fuit fracta et Christianus vix quasi nudus evasit et amisit omnes suos libros et sua bona et ille existens Pisis recordatus fuit praedictarum rationum, quas habuit cum supradicto Saraceno et ex illis composuit hunc librum." He sent this book to the pope and the cardinals, that they might learn what arguments the Mohammedans employed to draw away Christians from their faith. He laments to say, that by such arguments, and by the promise of riches and women, they win many to their religion. "Et quia Christiani non curant nec volunt auxilium dare Saracenis, qui se faciunt Christianos, inde est quod si unus Saracenus fit Christianus, decem Christiani et plures fiant Saraceni et de hoc habemus experimentum in regno Aegypti, de quo dicitur, quod tertia pars militiae Soldani fuerit Christiana."

hardships, he still continued, although far advanced in years, to prosecute his literary labors with unremitted zeal. At the age of sixty, he toiled on with the enthusiasm of youth to secure the one object which, ever since his conversion, had formed the central aim of his whole life. He says of himself: "I had a wife and children; I was tolerably rich; I led a secular life. All these things I cheerfully resigned for the sake of promoting the common good, and diffusing abroad the holy faith. I learned Arabic; I have several times gone abroad to preach the gospel to the Saracens. I have, for the sake of the faith, been cast into prison and scourged. I have labored forty-five years to gain over the shepherds of the church and the princes of Europe to the common good of Christendom. Now I am old and poor; but still I am intent on the same object. I will persevere in it till death, if the Lord himself permits it." He sought to found, in Pisa and Genoa, a new order of spiritual knights, who should be ready at a moment's warning, to go to war with the Saracens and for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He succeeded in exciting an interest in favor of his plan, and in obtaining letters to pope Clement the Fifth, in which this matter was recommended to the head of the church. Pious women and noblemen in Genoa offered to contribute the sum of thirty thousand guilders for this object. He proceeded with these letters to visit pope Clement the Fifth at Avignon; but his plan met with no encouragement from that pontiff. He next appeared as a teacher at Paris, and attacked with great zeal the principles of the philosophy of Averroes, and the doctrine it taught respecting the opposition between theological and philosophical truth.[1] Meanwhile, the time having arrived for the assembling of the general council of Vienne, A. D. 1311, he hoped there to find a favorable opportunity for carrying into effect the plan, which for so long a time had occupied his thoughts. He was intent on accomplishing three objects; first, the institution of those linguistic missionary schools, of which we have spoken on a former page; secondly, the union of the several orders of spiritual knights in a single one, which should not rest till the promised land was recovered; thirdly, a speedy adoption of successful measures for checking the progress of the principles of Averroes. To secure this latter object, men of suitable intellectual qualifications should be invited to combat those principles, and he himself composed a new work for this purpose. The first, he actually obtained from the pope. An ordinance was passed, for the establishment of professorships of the Oriental languages; advising that, in order to promote the conversion of the Jews and the Saracens, professional chairs should be established for the Arabic, Chaldee, and Hebrew languages, in all cities where the papal court resided, and also at the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. He now could not bear the thought of spending the close of his life at ease in his native land, to which he had returned for the last time. He desired nothing more than to

[1] His Lamentatio seu expostulatio philosophiae s. duodecim principia philosophiae, dedicated to the king of France, which he composed at Paris, in 1310, is directed against the Averroists.

offer up his life in the promulgation of the faith. Having spoken, in one of his works, of natural death, which he ascribed to the diminution of animal warmth, says he, "Thy servant would choose, if it please thee, not to die such a death; he would prefer that his life should end in the glow of love, as thou didst, in love, offer up thy life for us.[1]" "Thy servant," says he, "is ready to offer up himself, and to pour out his blood for thee. May it please thee, therefore, ere he comes to die, so to unite him to thyself that he by meditation and love may never be separated from thee." On the 14th of August, 1314, he crossed over, once more, to Africa. Proceeding to Bugia, he labored there, at first, secretly, in the small circle of those whom, during his last visit to that place, he had won over to Christianity. He sought to confirm their faith, and to advance them still farther in Christian knowledge. In this way, he might no doubt have continued to labor quietly for some time; but he could not resist the longing after martyrdom. He stood forth publicly, and declared that he was the same person whom they had once banished from the country; and exhorted the people, threatening them with divine judgments if they refused, to abjure Mohammedanism. He was fallen upon by the Saracens, with the utmost fury. After having been severely handled, he was dragged out of the city, and, by the orders of the king, stoned to death. Merchants, from Majorca, obtained permission to extricate the body of their countryman from the heaps of stones under which it lay buried, and they conveyed it back, by ship, to their native land. The 30th of June, 1315, was the day of his martyrdom.[2]

We must now cast a glance at the relation of the dispersed Jews to the Christian church.

As it regards the Jews, who were scattered in great numbers in the West, it is to be remarked, that the frequent oppressions, injuries, and persecutions, which they had to suffer from the fanaticism and cupidity of so-called Christians, were not well calculated to open their minds to the preaching of the gospel; though, through fear, and to escape the sufferings or the death with which they were threatened, they might be induced to submit to the form of baptism, and to put on the profession of Christianity.[3] Hermann, a monk of the twelfth century, from the monastery of Kappenberg, in Westphalia, who himself had been converted from Judaism to Christianity, speaking in the history which he has given of his own conversion, of the praiseworthy con-

[1] The words of Raymund, in his work de Contemplatione, c. cxxx, Distinct. 27, f. 299: "Homines morientes prae senectute moriuntur per defectum caloris naturalis et per excessum frigoris et ideo tuus servus et tuus subditus, si tibi placeret, non vellet mori tali morte, imo vellet mori prae amoris ardore, quia tu voluisti mori tali morte."

[2] We cannot in this place go back to the reports of contemporaries, but in the later accounts are to be found differences. According to one of them, he met his death in Tunis; according to another, he first went to Tunis, and afterwards proceeded to Bugia. If we may believe one account, the merchants, after having uncovered him from the heap of stones, found a spark of life still remaining; they succeeded in fanning this slumbering spark to the point of reanimation, but he died on board ship, when in sight of his native land.

[3] In the first crusade, the Jews in Rouen were, without distinction of sex or age, barred up in a church, and all who refused to receive baptism, murdered. See Guibert. Novigentens. de vita sua, l. ii, c. v.

duct of an ecclesiastic, from whom, when a Jew, he had met with kindly treatment, goes on to say: "Let those who read my account, imitate this illustrious example of love; and instead of despising and abhorring the Jews, as some are wont to do, let them, like genuine Christians, that is, followers of him who prayed for those that crucified him, go forth and meet them with brotherly love. For since, as our Saviour says, 'salvation cometh of the Jews.' (John 4: 22,) and as the apostle Paul testifies, 'through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles,' (Romans 11: 11,) it is a worthy return and well-pleasing to God, when Christians labor, so far as it lies in their power, for the salvation of those from whom they have received the author of their salvation, Jesus Christ. And if they are bound to extend their love even to those from whom they suffer wrong, how much more bound are they to show it to those through whom the greatest of all blessings has been derived to them? Let them, therefore, so far as they can, cherish their love for this people, helping them in their distresses, and setting them an example of all well-doing, so as to win by their example those whom they cannot persuade by their words; for example is really more effectual than words in producing conviction. Let them, also, send up fervent prayers to the Father of mercies, if peradventure God may one day give that people repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, 2 Timothy 2: 25." By means of the only business allowed to them, in their state of oppression, traffic and usury, they acquired great wealth; thereby, sometimes, attaining to great influence, even with monarchs; but this wealth, also, excited the cupidity of the great, and exposed them to be still more hated and persecuted.[1] The fanaticism awakened by the crusades was often directed against the Jews, as the domestic enemies of the Cross; and hundreds, nay thousands, fell victims to such animosity. Rumors became current against the Jews, of the same description as have prevailed, at all times, against religious sects persecuted by popular hatred; as, for example, against the first Christians, who were charged with such crimes as flattered the credulous fanaticism of the populace. It was said that they stole Christian children for their passover festival, and, after having crucified them with all imaginable tortures, used their entrails for magical purposes.[2] If a boy, especially near the time of the feast of Passover, was missed by his friends, or if the corpse of a boy, concerning whose death nothing certain was known, happened to be found, suspicion lighted at once upon the Jews of the district where the accident had occurred. Men could easily discover what they were intent on finding, — marks of the tortures which had been inflicted on the sufferers. It might doubtless happen,

[1] The Jew introduced in Abelard's dialogue concerning the supreme good, inter philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum, observes, in drawing a lively picture of the wretched situation of the Jews: "Unde nobis praecipue superest lucrum, ut alienigenis foenerantes, hinc miseram sustentemus vitam, quod nos quidem maxime ipsis efficit invidiosos, qui se in hoc plurimum arbitrantur gravatos." See this tract, published by Prof. Rheinwald, p. 11.

[2] In the historical work of Matthew, of Paris, are to be found many stories relating to persecutions of the Jews, which had been provoked by the circulation of such fables.

too, that enemies of the Jews, or those who gloated on their wealth, would disfigure the discovered bodies, in order to lend the more plausibility to the accusations brought against Jews. Hence a boy so found might sometimes be honored by the people as a martyr, and become the hero of a wonderful story.[1] The most extravagant of such tales might find credence in the existing tone of public sentiment, and seem to be confirmed by an investigation begun with prejudice, and conducted in a tumultuary manner. If, at the commencement of such movements, wealthy Jews betook themselves to flight, when they foresaw, as they must have foreseen, the disastrous issue to themselves, this passed for evidence of their guilt and of the truth of the rumors.[2] If twenty-five knights affirmed, on their oath, that the arrested Jews were guilty of the abominable crime, this sufficed to set the matter beyond all doubt, and to authorize the sentence of death.[3] Whoever interceded in behalf of the unfortunate victims, exposed himself by so doing to the popular hatred, which looked upon all such pity as suspicious. Thus, in the year 1256, pious Franciscans in England, who were not to be deterred by the force of the prevailing delusion, ventured to take the part of certain Jews, accused of some such abominable crime, that were languishing in prison; and they succeeded in procuring their release, and saving their lives. But now these monks, who had acted in the spirit of Christian benevolence, were accused of having allowed themselves to be bribed by money.[4] Thus they lost the good opinion of the lower class of people, who ever after refused to give them alms.[5]

These pious monks, and also the most influential men of the church protested against such unchristian fanaticism. When the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux was rousing up the spirit of the nations to embark in the second crusade, and issued for this purpose, in the year 1146, his letter to the Germans (East-Franks), he at the same time warned them against the influence of those enthusiasts, who called themselves messengers of the Lord, and strove to inflame the fanaticism of the people. He called upon the Germans to follow the direction of the apostle Paul, and not believe every spirit. He declaimed against the false zeal, without knowledge, which impelled them to murder the Jews, a people who ought not even to be banished from the country. He acknowledges their zeal for the cause of God; but requires that it should ever be accompanied with correct knowledge.[6] "The Jews," says he, "are scattered among all nations as living memorials of Christ's passion, and of the divine judgment. But there is a promise

[1] See Matth. of Paris, at the year 1244. Ed. London, 1686, f. 567. In the case here in question, men were forced to allow, that five wounds could in nowise be made out in the corpse discovered.

[2] See l. c.

[3] See the account given by the above-cited historian, at the year 1256, f. 792.

[4] The above historian, Matthew of Paris, otherwise a violent enemy of the mendicant monks, says, however, of this accusation: "Ut perhibet mundus, si mundo in tali casu credendum est." He himself only finds fault with the interposition of those Franciscans, since it is his opinion that those Jews had deserved death. But he honors in the Franciscans their compassion, and their charitable hope that these Jews might still, sometime or other, be converted.

[5] A. D. 1256, f. 792.

[6] Ep. 363. Audivimus et gaudemus, ut in vobis ferveat zelus Dei, sed oportet omnino temperamentum scientiae non deesse.

of their future universal restoration, Rom. 11: 26. Even where no Jews are to be found, usurious Christians, if such men deserve to be called Christians, and not rather baptized Jews, are a worse kind of Jews. How could the promise concerning the future conversion of the Jews ever be fulfilled, if they were utterly exterminated?" The same reasons, we must allow, ought to have persuaded men rather to send missionaries to the Mohammedan nations than to attack them with the sword. And, perhaps, it may have occurred to Bernard himself, that this principle might be applied to the very crusade which he preached. To guard against any such application, he adds, "If the same thing could be expected also of other infidels, we ought certainly to bear with them, rather than to persecute them with the sword. But as they were the first to begin the work of violence, so it becomes those who, not without cause, have taken up the sword, to repel force with force. But at the same time it befits Christian piety, while it strikes down the proud, to spare the humble (debellare superbos, parcere victis)." Such representations were especially needed in this excitable period; but these words written in the Latin language could never reach the overheated popular mind. In these times there had started up, in the districts on the Rhine, a ferocious enthusiast, the monk Radulf (Rudolph), who, representing himself as a called prophet of the Lord, preached, along with the Cross, death to the Jews. Thousands from Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Speier, Strasburg, who had collected together for the crusades, turned their swords, in the first place, against the defenceless Jews, and a great deal of blood was shed.[1] Rudolph would not be held back from obeying his imagined divine call by any authority of his ecclesiastical superior.[2] The archbishop Henry of Mentz, who could do nothing himself to counteract the influence of the enthusiast, applied for help to the French abbot, whose wonderful power over the minds of men was not unknown to him. Bernard, in his answer,[3] took very decided grounds against that monk. He found fault with his conduct in three respects; that he had taken it upon him to preach without being called, that he set at naught the authority of the bishops, and that he justified murder. This he called a doctrine of devils. "Does not the church," said he, "obtain a richer victory over the Jews, by daily bringing them over from their errors and converting them, than if by the sword she destroyed them all at a blow?" He appeals to the prayer of the universal church for the conversion of the Jews, with which such proceedings stood directly at variance. But it was not till Bernard went himself to Germany, and used his personal influence, which was

[1] The sufferings of the Jews have been depicted, after the account of a German Jew, who, being then a lad of thirteen, was a witness of this bloody massacre of his countrymen and fellow-believers, in a Jewish chronicle, in the Hebrew language, by Jehoschua Ben Meir, of the sixteenth century. See Wilken's Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, dritter Theil, erste Abtheil, Beilage i. In this account, too, Bernard is honorably mentioned as deliverer of the Jews, without whose interposition not one in these districts would have escaped; and he says in his praise, "he took no ransom-money from the Jews; for he from his heart spoke good concerning Israel."

[2] See Otto Frising. hist. Frederic the First, l. ii, c. 37.

[3] Ep. 365.

irresistible, that he could succeed in quelling the spirit of fanaticism. The people attached themselves to that enthusiast with so blind a devotion, that nothing but the veneration in which Bernard was held could restrain them from disturbances, when that leader was taken away from them. At Mentz, Bernard had a meeting with the monk Rudolph, and produced such an effect on him — which was indeed a marvel — by his expostulations, that the man acknowledged he had done wrong, and promised for the future to confine himself obediently to his convent. The celebrated abbot Peter of Cluny, who was distinguished for a mildness of disposition springing out of the spirit of Christian love, even beyond Bernard himself, — who showed so liberal and so kindly a spirit in judging the different spiritual tendencies among Christians, — even he can only look upon the Jews as a race descended from the murderers of Christ, and filled with hatred to him. "If the Saracens, who in respect to the faith in Christ have so much in common with us, are still to be abominated," he writes in his letter to king Louis the Seventh of France,[1] "how much more should we detest the Jews, who blaspheme and ridicule Christ, and the whole Christian faith." It is true, he declares himself opposed to the practice of massacring the Jews: "we should let them live, like the fratricide Cain, to their greater shame and torment," says he; but he calls upon the king to deprive them of their wealth, which they had acquired unrighteously and at the expense of Christians,[2] and to devote the money justly extorted from them to the service of the holy cause which they hated.

In particular, it was a ruling principle with *the popes*, after the example of their predecessor, Gregory the Great,[3] to protect the Jews in the rights which had been conceded to them. When the banished popes of the twelfth century returned to Rome, the Jews in their holiday garments went forth with the rest in procession, to meet them, bearing before them the thora; and Innocent the Second, on an occasion of this sort, prayed for them, that God would remove the veil from their hearts. Pope Innocent the Third, in the year 1199, published an ordinance, taking the Jews under his own protection against oppressions. "Much as the unbelief of the Jews is to be censured," he wrote, "yet, inasmuch as the Christian faith is really confirmed by them, they must suffer no hard oppression from the faithful." He appeals here to the example of his predecessors, which he followed: "No one should compel them by force to submit to baptism; but in case a Jew makes it known, that of his own free choice he has become a Christian, then no hindrances whatsoever shall be thrown in his way to prevent him from receiving baptism; for he who comes to the ordinance of Christian baptism through constraint, cannot be a true believer. No one should molest them in the possession of their

[1] Lib. iv, c. 36.

[2] Non enim de simplici agricultura, non de legali militia, non de quolibet honesto et utili officio horrea sua frugibus, cellaria vino, marsupia nummis, arcas auro sive argento cumulant, quantum de his, quae Christicolis dolose subtrahunt, de his quae furtim a furibus empta, vili pretio res carissimas comparant.

[3] See vol. iii, p. 13.

property, or in the observance of their customs. In the celebration of their festivals, they should not be disturbed by tumultuary proceedings."[1] This pope was at much pains to provide for the maintenance of Jews who embraced Christianity, and who by so doing lost the means of living which they before enjoyed.[2] It might doubtless happen, however, that the pope, when applied to for relief by converted Jews from distant parts, would sometimes be deceived by false reports, stories of miracles by which these persons pretended to have been converted. Still, he did not lend implicit confidence to such reports, but caused more exact inquiries to be made respecting their truth in the countries where such events were said to have occurred.[3]

When the Jews in France, in the year 1236, saw themselves abandoned to the ferocious cruelty of the crusaders, they, too, applied for help to the pope, then Gregory the Ninth. He in consequence sent a letter to France, expressing in the most emphatic language his indignation at such barbarity. "The crusaders, instead of arming themselves, body and soul, for a war which was to be carried on in the name of the Lord, instead of manifesting in their behavior so much the more fear of God, and love to God, as they were to fight in the cause of the Lord, had executed godless counsels against the Jews. But, in so doing, they had not considered that Christians must derive the evidences of their faith from the archives of the Jews, and that the Lord would not reject his people forever, but a remnant of them should be saved. Not considering this, they had acted as if they meant to exterminate them from the earth, and with unheard of cruelty had butchered two thousand and five hundred persons of all ages and sexes. And in extenuation of this atrocious crime, they affirmed they had done so, and threatened to do worse, because the Jews would not be baptized. "They did not consider," writes the pope, "that while Christ excludes no nation and no race from the salvation which he came to bring to all mankind; still, as everything depends on the inward operation of divine grace, as the Lord has mercy on whom he will have mercy, no man should be forced to receive baptism; for as man fell by his own freewill, yielding to the temptation to sin, so with his own freewill he must follow the call of divine grace, in order to be recovered from his fall."[4] Pope Innocent the Fourth, to whom the Jews of Germany complained, on account of the oppressions and persecutions, which they had to suffer from secular and spiritual lords, issued a brief, in the year 1248, for their protection. In this brief, he declared the story about the Christian boy murdered for the cele-

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 302.

[2] E. g. l. ii, ep. 234. Attenta est sollicitudine providendum, ne inter alios Christi fideles inedia deprimantur, cum plerique horum pro indigentia necessariarum rerum post receptum baptismum in confusionem non modicam inducantur, ita ut plerumque faciente illorum avaritia, qui cum ipsi abundent, Christum pauperem respicere dedignantur, retro cogantur abire.

[3] Like that extravagant tale of a Jew, who found in a chest of gold, in which a stolen consecrated host had been deposited, the gold pieces converted into holy wafers. The pope directed the bishop in the place where this Jew lived, at the same time that he recommended him and his family to his care, to make a full and careful examination with regard to the truth of that story, and return him a faithful report. Innocent. l. xvi, ep. 84.

[4] See Raynaldi Annales ad A. 1236, § 48.

bration of the Jewish passover, a pure fiction, invented solely for the purpose of hiding cupidity and cruelty, and of getting Jews condemned without the formality of a trial. Wherever a dead body happened to be found, it was maliciously made use of as a means of criminating the Jews.[1]

Again, the Jews would unavoidably be shocked and repelled by those peculiarities in the shaping of the church at this time, which, though grounded in an original Christian feeling, yet in their extravagance bordered upon the pagan; as, for example, the worship of saints and images. Pious ecclesiastics and monks were always ready to enter into controversial discussions with Jews, in the hope of convincing them by arguments; although laymen, in the zeal for their religious creed, were dissatisfied with a mode of procedure, which allowed the Jews so peacefully to state all their objections to the Christian faith, and required others so patiently to listen to them. They, on the contrary, were for deciding the matter at once, and punishing the unbelief of the Jews with the sword.[2] In such disputes, the Jews levelled their objections not only against the fundamental position of the Christian system in itself considered, which to the fleshly Jewish mode of thought, clinging to the letter of the Old Testament and to sensual expectations, must at all times be alike offensive; but also against those excrescent growths so foreign to primitive Christianity. And although Christian theologians, in the confidence and in the light of Christian faith, could say many excellent things about the relation of the Old and New Testaments, and of their different comparative positions, still, they were no match for the Jews in the interpretation of the Old Testament; and their arbitrary allegorizing explications could not remove any of the difficulties, by which the Jews were stumbled in comparing the Old Testament with the New, nor lead

[1] Scriptura divina inter alia mandata legis dicente: non occides, ac prohibente illos in sollennitate paschali quicquam morticinum contingere, falsa imponunt iisdem, quod in ipsa sollennitate se corde pueri communicant interfecti, credendo id ipsam legem praecipere, cum sit legi contrarium manifeste, ac eis malitiose objiciunt hominis cadaver mortui, si contigerit illud alicubi reperiri. Et per hoc et alia quamplurima figmenta saevientes in ipsis eos super his non accusatos, nec convictos spoliant contra Deum et justitiam omnibus suis, etc. Raynaldi Annales ad A. 1248, § 84.

[2] Joinville narrates, in the Memoirs of Louis the Ninth: Once a great controversial discussion started up in the monastery of Cluny, between the ecclesiastics and Jews, when an old knight rose up and demanded that the most distinguished among the ecclesiastics and the most learned among the Jews should come forward. Then he asked the Jew, whether he believed that Christ was born of the virgin? When the Jew replied in the negative, said the knight to him, you behave, then, very foolishly and presumptuously, in daring to come into a house consecrated to Mary — the convent. He dealt the Jew so violent a blow, that he sunk to the ground, and the rest fled for their lives. The abbot of Cluny now said to the knight: "Vous avez fait folie, de ce que vous avez ainsi frappé." The knight, however, would not acknowledge this, but rejoined: "Vous avez fait encore plus grande folie, d'avoir ainsi assemblé les Juifs et souffert telles disputations d'erreurs;" for many good Christians had thereby been misled into infidelity. So thought, too, king Louis the Ninth of France. None but learned theologians should dispute with the Jews; nor should the laity ever listen to such blasphemies, but punish them at once with the sword. "Que nul, si n'est grand clerc et théologien parfait, ne doit disputer aux Juifs. Mais doit l'homme lay, quant il oy mesdire la foi chrétienne, défendre la chose non pas seulement des paroles, mais à bonne épée tranchante et en frapper les mesdisans à travers du corps, tant qu'elle y pourra entrer."

them away from the letter to the spirit. A narrow slavery to the letter, and an arbitrary spiritualization, here stood confronted. We hear a Jew,[1] for example, appealing to the eternal validity of the law. "A curse is pronounced upon every man, that observes not the whole law," says he; "what right or authority have you Christians to make here an arbitrary distinction, to explain that some things are to be observed, while others are done away with? How is this to be reconciled with the immutability of God's word?" He finds in the Old Testament the prediction of a Messiah, but nothing concerning a God-man. The doctrine concerning such a being appeared to him a disparagement of God's glory. The promises relating to the times of the Messiah seem to him not yet fulfilled. "If it be true that the Messiah is already come, how are we to reconcile it with the fact that, nowhere except among the poor people of the Jews, is it said, 'Come, let us go up to the house of the God of Jacob?' Some of you say, let us go to the house of Peter; others, let us go to the house of Martin. Where is it that swords are turned into pruning-hooks? Smiths enough can hardly be found to convert steel into weapons of war. One nation oppresses, cuts in pieces another; and every boy is trained up to the use of weapons." The Christian theologian, abbot Gislebert, replies to the last objection: "Neither to Peter nor Paul do we build a house; but in honor and in memory of Peter or Paul we build a house to God. Nor can any bishop, in dedicating a church, say, 'To thee, Peter or Paul, we dedicate this house or this altar;' but only, 'to thee, O God, we dedicate this house or this altar for the glory of God.'" Next, he insists on it that those promises concerning the times of the Messiah have been spiritually fulfilled. "The law pronounces sentence of condemnation on every man who kills, or rather, as Christ has added, on every man who is angry with his brother. He, then, who is transported with the passions of anger and hatred, cannot lawfully use the sword and lance. Far easier is it to turn the sword into a ploughshare, the spear into a pruning-hook, than to turn from a proud man into an humble one, from a freeman to a servant; to give up wife, children, house and court, arms, all earthly goods, and very self. This, however, is a thing that you may often see done; for many, who once lived in the world, proud and mighty men, constantly buckled for war, greedy after other men's possessions, have for God's sake renounced all worldly glory, go in voluntary poverty on pilgrimages to different holy places, seek the intercession of the saints, or immure themselves in a convent. And, in such a community of the servants of God, is fulfilled that which God promised by the prophets concerning the peaceful living together of the lion and the lamb, etc.; for, to the shepherd of such a flock, obedience is alike paid by high and low, by the mighty and the powerful, the strong and the weak."

An example, showing how the powers of Christianity was still present, even amid the foreign rubbish with which it was encumbered,

[1] In the Disputatio Judaei cum Christiano de fide Christiana by the abbot Gislebert (Gilbert) of Westminster, in the beginning of the twelfth century, which is founded on a dispute actually held with a Jew,—in Anselmi Cant. opp. ed. Gerberon, f. 512.

and could make itself be felt in the minds of the Jews, is seen in the remarkable case of Hermann, afterwards a Premonstratensian monk, whose conversion, which he has given an account of himself,[1] was brought about by a singular train of providential occurrences.

He was born at Cologne, and strictly educated as a Jew. When a young man he made a journey to Mentz, on commercial business. It happened at the same time that Egbert, bishop of Münster,[2] who had himself at some earlier period been dean of the cathedral at Cologne, was there with the emperor's court-camp. Being in want of money, the bishop negotiated a loan with this Jew. But the latter took no security from him, which was quite contrary to the practice of his people, who were accustomed to require a pledge to the amount of double the sum lent. When he returned home, his friends reproached him for such folly, and urged him to seek another interview with the bishop. Fearing, however, the influence of the Christians on the young man, they commissioned an old Jew, Baruch, to act as his overseer. Thus he travelled back to Münster; and here, as the bishop could not immediately refund the money, he was obliged to tarry five months. The young man, having no particular business on his hands, could not resist the curiosity he felt to visit the churches, which he had hitherto detested as temples of idols. He here heard the bishop preach. Many things in the discourse attracted him, and he repeated his visits. Thus he received his first Christian impressions. Christians, observing how attentively he listened, asked him, how he liked what he heard; he replied, "Many things pleased him, others not." They spoke to him kindly: "Our Jesus," said they, "is full of compassion, and, as he himself declares, 'No man that cometh unto him shall be cast out.'" They held up to him the example of the apostle Paul, who from a violent persecutor of Christianity became a zealous preacher of it. But the Jew saw pictures of Christ in the churches, and as this appeared to him like idolatry, he was filled with abhorrence. Thus different impressions struggled together in his soul. It so happened, that the universally revered abbot Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis, the author of a tract against the Jews) came to Münster, and to him Hermann ventured to disclose his doubts. The abbot received him in a friendly manner, and sought to convince him, that the Christians were very far from paying an idolatrous worship to images. "Images," said he, "are designed solely to supply the place of Scripture for the rude people."

The bishop employed as the steward of his house a pious ecclesiastic named Richmar, a man of strictly ascetic habits, who by his kindly manners had won his way to the young man's heart. Once the bishop sent a choice dish from his own table to this churchman: but he immediately gave it to the young Hermann who sat by his side, while he himself took nothing but bread and water. This made a great impression on the youth. As this pious man, in many conversations

[1] Published by Carpzov, after Raymund Martini's Pugio fidei.

[2] Bishop of Münster from 1127 to 1132

with Hermann, had sought in vain to convince him of the truth of Christianity, he finally conceived the hope that by the evidence of some miracle, a judgment of God, the ordeal of the red-hot iron,[1] he might be able to conquer the unbelief of the sign-seeking Jew. But the bishop, his superior in Christian knowledge and wisdom, would allow of no such experiment. Said he to his steward, "True, thy zeal is praiseworthy, but it is not accompanied with knowledge. We should not presume to tempt God in this way; but we should pray to him, that he, who wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, would be pleased, in his own time and way, by his grace, to break the fetters of unbelief in which this young man is bound captive, and set him free. But it was not proper to require God to work a miracle for this purpose, nor even to be particularly anxious that he would; since it was perfectly easy for the Almighty even without a miracle by the secret operation of his grace, to convert whomsoever he pleased; and since, too, the outward miracle would be unavailing, unless he wrought after an invisible manner by his grace in the heart of the man. Many had been converted without miracles; multitudes had remained unbelievers even after miracles had been wrought before their eyes. The faith induced by miracles had little or no merit in the sight of God; but the faith which came from a simple pious sense had the greatest," which he sought to prove by examples from gospel history and from the words of Christ himself.

When Hermann afterwards had an opportunity of visiting the newly founded Premonstratensian convent at Kappenberg in Westphalia, and here saw men of the highest and lowest ranks unite together in practising the same self-denials, it appeared to him a very strange sight; as yet he knew not what to make of it. Thus he was tossed one way and another by his feelings, till his mind became completely unsettled. He prayed to God, with warm tears, that if the Christian faith came from him, he would either by inward inspiration, or by vision, or — which then appeared to him the most effective means — by some visible miraculous sign, convince him of it. He who was said to have led a Paul, even when he proudly resisted, to the faith, would assuredly, if this were true, hear him, so humble a supplicant!

After his return home he spent three days, strictly fasting, in prayer to the Almighty, and waiting in expectation of a vision for the clearing up of his doubts; when, exhausted by fasting and by his inward conflicts, he retired to rest; but the vision which he sought, was not vouchsafed to him. He applied to book-learned churchmen, and disputed with them; yet to all the arguments which they could bring, his doubts were invincible; although many of the remarks which fell from them left a sting behind in his heart.

Meanwhile the Jews had long eyed him with suspicion; and they employed every means to deter him from embracing Christianity. They prevailed upon him to marry; and by the wedding-feast and the dissipations connected with his new relation, he was, in fact, diverted

[1] See vol iii, pp. 130, 449.

for a while from the subject which had so long occupied and tormented him. But after passing three months in a state of dreamy torpor, his old inward conflicts returned again. He once more sought the society of Christian theologians, with whom he had many disputes. Once, after he had long contended with one of these theologians in an assembly of clergymen, said one of the number to the theologian who had sought in vain to convince him: "Why spend your strength to no purpose? Surely you know that, as the apostle Paul declares, even to this day, when to the Jews Moses is read, a covering hangs before their hearts." This remark again made a deep impression on Hermann's mind. "Is my heart," thought he, "really prevented by such a covering from penetrating to the spirit of the Old Testament?" Again, therefore, he had recourse to prayer, and with many tears besought the Almighty that, if this were so, he would himself remove the covering from his heart, that he might with open eyes behold the clear light of truth. And recollecting what Christians had said to him about the power of intercessions, he commended himself to the prayers of two nuns who stood in high veneration among all the Christians in Cologne. They promised him, that they would not cease praying until the comfort of divine grace should be given to him. Becoming soon afterwards more clear in his views and feelings, he believed himself to be especially indebted for this change to the intercessions of these two pious nuns.[1] He continued diligently to attend on the preached word, putting aside everything else, and making the search after truth the great object of his life. His inquiries and prayers conducted him at length to a settled conviction. He submitted to baptism, entered the monastery of Kappenberg, which on his first visit had made so singular an impression on his mind, where he studied the Latin language, and was consecrated a priest.

[1] He says: "Ecce me, quem ad fidem Christi nec reddita mihi a multis de ea ratio, nec magnorum potuit clericorum convertere disputatio, devota simplicium feminarum oratio attraxit."

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

I. Popes and Papacy.

We commence this period in the history of the papacy, with a crisis of world-historical interest. The great question was now up, to be answered by the course of events: Whether the system of the church theocracy, the spiritual universal monarchy, should come off victorious in the contest with a rude secular power, or should be laid prostrate under its feet. The key to the right understanding of this new epoch is furnished us by the epoch with which the preceding period closed. One continuous thread of historical evolution; a closely connected series of causes and effects proceeds onward from the last times of the preceding period into the beginning of the present. The corruption of the church, threatening its utter secularization, had now reached its highest pitch; and that very circumstance had called forth a reformatory reaction on the part of the church. Such a reaction could, however, under the existing conditions, only proceed from the side of this church theocracy; since those who were most zealous against the abuses that had crept in, were governed by this spiritual tendency. The *man* of this party, he who was in fact the guiding and animating soul of the reformatory reaction in the last times of the preceding period, was that *Hildebrand*, who now, as pope Gregory the Seventh, had become in name, as he had long been secretly in fact, the ruling head of the Western church. As this world-historical personage was, from the first, the object of extravagant veneration with some, and of equally extravagant hatred with others, so the same contrariety of opinion with regard to him continued to prevail in the succeeding centuries.

Gregory was certainly inspired with some higher motive than selfish ambition, a selfish love of domination. One predominating *idea* inspired him; and to this he sacrificed all other interests, the idea of the independence of the church, and of the control to be exercised by her over all other human relations, the idea of a religious, moral dominion over the world, to be administered by the papacy. This was not, indeed, the purely Christian idea of dominion over the world, but a recasting of it under an Old Testament form altogether foreign to Christianity; and that, too, not without some mixture of the idea of

Rome's ancient imperial sovereignty.[1] This idea, however, was no invention of Gregory's; but having sprung, as we have shown, out of the course of development which the church had taken, it had acquired, by the reaction in favor of reform since the time of Leo the Ninth, a new force over the minds of the better-disposed. There were men, extremely prejudiced, it is true, yet animated by a warm zeal for the welfare of the church and against the deep-rooted abuses of the times, who expected, from this imperial sovereignty of the church, wielded by the popes, the correction of all evils. To them the church appeared as the representative of the divine jurisdiction, by which all social relations were to be regulated, all abuses to be removed. The church must by her equitable decisions prevent wars; or, if she could not effect this, bestow communion and absolution on the party in the right, while she excluded the one in the wrong from the fellowship of the church, and refused it the privilege of ecclesiastical burial to the dead.[2] The monk Hildebrand had certainly been seized with this idea, and active in endeavoring to realize it, before he could have entertained any thought of being elevated himself to the papal throne. Educated as a monk at Rome, it was natural that, in a man of his serious disposition, and situated as he was, the idea of such a jurisdiction to be exercised by the church, should be awakened in the fullest force.[3] Well might his disgust at the prevailing corruption in Rome

[1] Compare the poem by Alphanus, quoted in vol. iii, at the close of the second section, part i, p. 399.

[2] This idea is unfolded by that rigid censor of the clergy, a contemporary of Bernard of Clairvaux, the sincerely pious provost Gerhoh (Geroch) of Reichersberg in Bavaria, particularly in his commentary on the 64th Psalm, or his tract De corrupto ecclesiae statu, where he sets it over against the then corrupt condition of the church, which should be restored and improved according to this standard, — published by Baluz in the fifth volume of his Miscellanea. The same tract of Geroch is to be found abbreviated in his commentary on the Psalms; — an important work on account of the information it gives us of the condition of the church in these times, — published by Pez in the Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, t. v. He looks upon it as a strange and unheard of thing, that both the contending parties in a war should receive the communion: when in truth justice could only be on one side, and the tribunal of the church therefore could decide in favor of but one party. In omni militum vel civium guerra et discordia vel pars altera justa et altera injusta, vel utraque invenitur injusta, cujus rei veritatem patefacere deberet sacerdotalis doctrina, sine cujus censura nulla bella sunt movenda. Sic ergo manifestata justitia pars justa sacerdotalibus tubis animanda et etiam communione dominici corporis ante bellum et ad bellum roboranda est, quia panis iste cor hominis confirmat, quando pro defensione justitiae vel ecclesiae aliquis ad pugnam se praeparat, cui pars iniqua resistens et pacto justae pacis acquiescere nolens anathematizanda et etiam negata sibi sepultura christiana humilianda est. But how is it at present, when — one prince or one people waging an unjust war against another — the Lord's body is given to both parties without examination of the merits of the case? Tanquam divisus sit Christus et possit esse in tam contrariis partibus. How easily, he exclaims, by the united agreement of the bishops in one judgment, could the madness of those princes and knights who make confusion in the Roman empire, and spread devastation through the church, be curbed and restrained? If he, then, who has been placed over the whole, in order to preserve unity and to strengthen his brethren, Luke 22: 32, should in every just judgment anticipate the bishops by a circular letter addressed to them — what monarch would dare to set himself up in opposition to such a decision? Cum sit velut alter Jeremias, constitutus non solum super ecclesias, sed etiam super regna, ut evellat et destruat, aedificet et plantet. See l. c. in Pez. f. 1183.

[3] Where he speaks of his obligations to the apostle Peter, in a letter to king William of England, l. vii, ep. 23. Quia S. Petrus a puero me in domo sua dulciter nutrierat.

and Italy have moved Hildebrand the monk to retreat with his friend, the deposed pope Gregory the Sixth, to the countries beyond the Alps; and well might he again, in the hope of being able, by virtue of his connection with the popes, to counteract this corruption, have resolved to return back to Rome; as he says, in a remarkable letter to his friend, the abbot Hugo of Cluny:[1] "Were it not that I hoped to attain to a yet better life, and to serve the cause of the church, nothing would induce me to stay here in Rome, where, not by my own choice, as God is my witness, I have already been compelled to live through a period of twenty years." "God," he remarks, "had brought him back to Rome against his will, and bound him there with his own fetters."[2] In passing judgment on this great man, we should not try him by the standard of a pure evangelical knowledge to which he could not possibly have attained by his course of training. Seized and carried away by the above-mentioned dominant idea, he interpreted by that the testimonies of the Bible and of history, and these would all seem to confirm the same. But he who surrenders himself so entirely to one idea, seen in one aspect, as to let it swallow up all other human interests, and all the feelings, implanted in man's nature, must become a slave to it. He who allows the zeal for such an idea to usurp the place of a zeal for truth and justice, will soon have formed within himself a *particular conscience* also which may sanction many things, tending to the advantage of his party-bent, that a true conscience and the divine law would condemn. He who believes himself the vicegerent of the divine will in the government of mankind, will easily be misled, to set up *his own* will in place of the divine, and then think himself entitled to take many liberties for the realization of that divine will. With his fanatical self-devotion to this one tendency, this energetic man united a calculating prudence not always coupled with truth; as we have had occasion to see already in his treatment of that upright follower of the interests of truth alone, Berengarius.

It is certain that Hildebrand's power in Rome had become so great, he had so considerable a party in his favor, that no intrigues were needed on his part to secure for him the papal dignity, an eminence which he might have reached sooner, perhaps, if he had desired it; for, as it was justly remarked of him in his own time, "after having prepared everything to suit his wishes, he stepped into the papal chair the moment he was ready."[3] The less to be credited, there-

[1] L. c. l. ii, ep. 49. Gregory himself says to the Romans: "Vos scitis, quod ad sacros ordines *non libenter* accessi, sed *magis invitus* cum Domino Leone Papa ad vestram specialem ecclesiam redii, in qua utcunque vobis servivi." Eccard scriptores rer. Germ. ep. 150.

[2] Si non sperarem ad meliorem vitam et utilitatem sanctae ecclesiae venire, nullo modo Romae, in qua coactus, Deo teste, jam a viginti annis inhabitavi, remanerem — and afterwards — eum, qui me suis alligavit vinculis et Roman invitum reduxit.

[3] Praeparatis ex sententia, quae voluit, Cathedram quando voluit ascendit. So speak Gregory's opponents in the noticeable tract of Dieteric, bishop of Verdun, A. D. 1080, in Martene et Durand thesaur. nov. anecdotorum, t. v, f. 217. Cited in the same place are opposite views respecting Gregory's previous conduct and his election to the papacy. One party says of him.

fore, are the accusations which his opponents, even in published writings, had the boldness to bring against him.[1] Still, some occasion was given for these accusations, by the mode in which Gregory's election was conducted.

The death of pope Alexander was not followed by the disturbances so common on such occasions among the Roman people, who were accustomed to manifest very soon their predilection for this or that cardinal whom they chose to have pope. The college of cardinals, therefore, supposed they had no interruption to fear in their preparatory proceedings to the choice of a new pope, and they ordered that, before they met to make arrangements for the new election, prayers for illumination and guidance should be addressed to the Almighty in connection with processions and fasting during three days.[2] Yet at the burial of Alexander, the people loudly demanded that Hildebrand should be made pope.[3] Although the legal form, therefore, was *afterwards* observed, and a protocol adopted, certifying to Hildebrand's election, yet it is manifest that the choice had already been made. Gregory declares, in the letters issued soon after his election, and later, that he had been elevated to the papal dignity against his will, and not without strenuous opposition on his part. Still, the sincerity of such professions is always more or less liable to suspicion. Even though it was Gregory's determination, after he had thus far ruled by means of others, now to take the government of the church into his own hands; yet we may at all events believe that he must have foreseen the difficult contests into which he would be thrown; and that, undertaking to exercise such a trust, would turn out to him no idle affair; and amid the multiplied troubles and vexations of his later reign, he might well sigh after the tranquil seclusion of the monastic life. In a letter to duke Gottfried, who had congratulated him on his election,[4] he complains of the secret cares and anxieties which oppressed him. "Nearly the whole world is lying in such wickedness, that all, and the bishops in particular, seem emulous to destroy

Decedentibus patribus *saepe electum et accitum*, semper *quidem animi*, aliquando etiam corporis fuga dignitatis locum declinasse; at length he recognized in the universal voice, the will of God. Others, Gregory's ferocious enemies, say many things hardly consistent with one another, and even self-contradictory, respecting the manner in which he attained to the papal throne. The truth perhaps is contained in their single remark, "quando voluit;" but this circumstance is easily to be accounted for by his previous activity, and makes all the other explanations of his papal election superfluous.

[1] Cardinal Benno, in his invective against Gregory, says, that when pope Alexander, sub miserabili jugo Hildebrandi, died one evening, Hildebrand was placed by his partisans at once, and without the concurrence of the clergy and the community, upon the papal throne, because it was feared that, if there were any delay, some other person would be elected; not one of the cardinals subscribed to it. (All which, however, is refuted by the published protocol certifying his election.) To the abbot of Monte Cassino, who arrived after the election was over, Gregory is said to have remarked: "Frater, nimium tardasti," to which the abbot replied: Et tu, Hildebrande, nimium festinasti, qui nondum sepulto domino tuo papa, sedem apostolicam contra canones usurpasti.

[2] As Gregory himself declares, in the letters in which he made known his election.

[3] He himself says: Subito ortus est magnus tumultus populi et fremitus, et in me quasi vesani insurrexerunt, nil dicendi, nil consulendi facultatis aut spatii relinquentes

[4] Ep. 9.

rather than to defend or to adorn the church. Striving only after gain and honor, they stand opposed to everything which serves to promote religion and the cause of God." In the second year of his reign, he presented a picture of his troubles and conflicts, in a letter, to his intimate friend, the abbot Hugo of Cluny.[1] Often have I prayed God, either to release me from the present life, or through me to benefit our common mother; yet he has not delivered me from my great sufferings; nor has my life, as I wished, profited the mother with whom he has connected me." He then describes the lamentable condition of the church: "The Oriental church, fallen from the faith, and attacked from without, by the infidels. Casting your eye over the West, South, or North, you find scarcely anywhere bishops who have obtained their office regularly, or whose life and conversation correspond to its requirements, and who are actuated in the discharge of their duties by the love of Christ and not by worldly ambition;[2] nowhere, princes who prefer God's honor to their own, and justice before gain." "The men among whom he lived," he said, "Romans, Longobards, Normans, were, as he often told them, worse than Jews and pagans." "And when I look at myself," he adds, "I find myself oppressed by such a burden of sin, that no other hope of salvation is left me, but in the mercy of Christ alone." And, indeed, it is a true picture, which Gregory here draws of his times.

Before we follow out the acts of Gregory in detail, let us cast a glance at the principles of his conduct generally, as they are exhibited to us in his letters. Those persons assuredly mistake him, who are willing to recognize nothing else, as his governing principle, than prudence. Though it is, indeed, true, that prudence formed one of his most distinguishing characteristics; yet, believing as he did, that he acted in virtue of a trust committed to him by God, — it was a higher confidence, which sustained and kept him erect through all his conflicts. It was in perfect consistency with those views, which he had derived from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, respecting the theocracy, that he should so readily allow himself to be guided by supernatural signs, and judgments of God. He placed great reliance on his intimate connections with St. Peter and the Virgin Mary.[3] Among his confidential agents he had a monk, who boasted of a peculiar intimacy with the Virgin Mary; and to this person he applied, in all doubtful cases, bidding him seek, with prayer and fasting, for some special revelation, by vision, respecting the matter in question.[4] To his friend, the Margravine Mathilda, who honored and loved him as a

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 49.

[2] Vix legales episcopos introitu et vita, qui Christianum populum Christi amore et non seculari ambitione regant.

[3] By this pope, a special office of devotion, addressed to the Virgin Mary, was introduced into the monasteries. See the above-mentioned work of Geroch, on the Psalms, l. c. fol. 794: "Et in coenobiis canticum novum celebratur, cum a tempore Gregorii septi cursus beatae Mariae frequentatur." Also, in the above-cited letter of Dieteric of Verdun, mention is made of divine visions which were attributed to Gregory; and it is said of him, "Juxta quod boni et fide digni homines attestantur, eum non parvam in oculis Dei familiaritatis gratiam assecutum esse."

[4] A writer of this time, the abbot Haymo, relates in his life of William, abbot of Hirschau, that Gregory, being uncertain which of two candidates proposed to him

spiritual father, he earnestly recommended,[1] as a means of defence against the princes of the world, that she should frequently partake of the Holy supper, and commit herself to the special protection of the Virgin Mary. The peculiar bent of his own devotion, here expresses itself: "I, myself," he writes, "have expressly commended thee to her, and will not cease commending thee to her, till we shall behold her, as we long to do. She, whom heaven and earth cease not to praise, though they cannot do it as she deserves. But of this, be firmly persuaded, that, as she is exalted, good, and holy above every mother, so too, and in the same proportion, is she more gracious and gentle towards converted sinful men and women. Put away, then, the disposition to sin, pour out thy tears before her, prostrating thyself before her with an humble and contrite heart; and I promise it with certainty, thou shalt find, by experience, how much more full of love and kindness she will be to thee than thine own mother acccording to the flesh."[2]

Gregory decidedly avows the principle, that God had conferred on Peter and his successors, not only the guidance of the whole church in respect to spiritual affairs, but also a moral superintendence over all nations. To the spiritual, he maintains, everything else should be subordinated. All worldly interests are vastly inferior to the spiritual. How, then, should not the juridical authority of the pope extend over them?[3] We find Gregory entertaining an idea, which is expressed also in other writings of this party, according to which, the priestly authority would appear to be the only one truly ordained of God,— the authority, by which everything was finally to be brought back into the right train; for the authority of princes grew originally out of sinful self-will, the primitive equality of mankind having been broken up by the violence of those, who by rapine, murder, and every other species of atrocity, elevated themselves above their equals;[4] — a view which might be confirmed, in the minds of some, on contemplating

should be selected for a bishopric, directed a monk to pray that it might be revealed to him, by the mediation of the Virgin Mary, which would be the best choice. See his Life, § 22, in Mabillon's Acta Sanct. O. B. t. vi, p. ii, f. 732. As this anecdote wholly agrees with what we quoted, vol. iii, p. 519, from the mouth of Berengar, we are the less warranted to entertain any doubt respecting this characteristic trait in the life of Gregory. Compare also vol. iii, pp. 384–385.

[1] Lib. i, ep. 47.

[2] Cui te principaliter commisi et committo et nunquam committere, quousque illam videamus, ut cupimus, omittam, quid tibi dicam, quam coelum et terra laudare, licet ut meretur nequeant, non cessant? Hoc tamen procul dubio teneas, quia quanto altior et melior ac sanctior est omni matre, tanto clementior et dulcior circa conversos peccatores et peccatrices. Pone itaque finem in voluntate peccandi et prostrata coram illa ex corde contrito et humiliato lacrimas effunde. Invenies illam, indubitanter promitto, promptiorem carnali matre ac mitiorem in tui dilectione.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 63. Petrus apostolus, quem Dominus Jesus Christus rex gloriae principem super regna mundi constituit. Lib. vii, ep. 6, concerning Peter: Cui omnes principatus et potestates orbis terrarum subjiciens (Deus) jus ligandi atque solvendi in coelo et in terra tradidit. In a letter to king William of England, in which the pope certainly was inclined to lower rather than to elevate his tone: Ut cura et dispensatione apostolicæ dignitatis post Deum gubernetur regia.

[4] In the famous letter to bishop Hermann of Metz, l. viii, ep. 21: Quis nesciat reges et duces ab iis habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes, superbia, rapinis, perfidia, homicidiis, postremo universis paene scleribus, mundi principe diabolo videlicet agitante, super pares, scilicet homines, dominari caeca cupiditate et intolerabili praesumtione affectaverunt?

the then rude condition of civil society. Yet, in other places, when not pushed by opposition to this extreme, he recognizes the kingly authority as also ordained of God; only maintaining, that it should confine itself within its own proper limits, remaining subordinate to the papal power which is sovereign over all. He says that the two authorities stand related to each other, as sun and moon, and compares them with the two eyes of the body.[1]

We see by single examples, how welcome it would have been to the pope, if all monarchs had been disposed to receive their kingdoms as feofs of the apostle Peter. Thus he would have converted the sovereignty of Peter into an altogether secular empire; and he looked upon it as an insult to that sovereignty, that a king of Hungary, who ought to have regarded himself as a king dependent on St. Peter, should place himself in a relation of dependence on the German empire. He considered it deserving of reproach, that he should be willing to undergo the shame of making himself a dependent *regulus* on German kings, rather than to enjoy the honor of being dependent alone on the first of the apostles.[2] And to this he referred the promise of Christ regarding the Rock, against which the powers of hell should never prevail; that whoever would wrest his kingdom out of this relation of dependence to the church of Rome, must experience, by the loss of his inherited kingdom, the punishment due to his *sacrileye*, in his own person. So Spain was held to have been from the earliest times a feof of the Romish church.[3] From the Romish church, it was maintained, indeed, that *all other spiritual* authority was derived, and all ecclesiastical authorities should appear as organs of the pope; yet among these authorities there should subsist a regular subordination; and all, through a certain series of gradations, return back to the one common head.[4] Gregory professed, it is true, in continuing the contest begun by the popes at the close of the preceding period, that he acted as defender of the ancient ecclesiastical laws; yet, at the same time, also, he expressly declared, that it stood in his power to enact new laws against new abuses, which, when enacted, imposed an obligation of universal obedience.[5] As he frequently made use of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which, by

[1] Lib. i, ep. 19. Nam sicut duobus oculis humanum corpus temporali lumine regitur, ita his duabus dignitatibus in pura religione concordantibus corpus ecclesiae spirituali lumine regi et illuminari probatur. Lib. vii, ep. 25, to king William of England: Sicut ad mundi pulchritudinem oculis carneis diversis temporibus repraesentandam solem et lunam omnibus aliis eminentiora disposuit luminaria, sic ne creatura, quam sui benignitas ad imaginem suam in hoc mundo creaverat, in errorem et mortifera traheretur pericula, providit in apostolica et regia dignitate, per diversa regeretur officia. Qua tamen majoritatis et minoritatis distantia religio sic se movet Christiana, ut cura et dispensatione apostolicae dignitatis post Deum gubernetur regia.

[2] Lib. ii, ep. 70, to king Geusa of Hungary: Ubi contempto nobili dominio Petri, apostolorum principis, rex subdidit se Teutonico regi, et reguli nomen obtinuit, et ita si quid in obtinendo regno juris prius habuit, eo se sacrilega usurpatione privavit. Petrus a firma petra dicitur, quae portas inferi confringit atque adamantino rigore destruit et dissipat quidquid obsistit.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 7.

[4] Lib. vi. ep. 35.

[5] Lib. ii, ep. 67. Huic sanctae Romanae ecclesiae semper licuit semperque licebit, contra noviter increscentes excessus nova quoque decreta atque remedia procurare, quae rationis et auctoritatis edita judicio nulli hominum sit fas ut irrita refutare. And ep. 68: Non nostra decreta, quan-

reason of his peculiar mode of apprehending the theocracy, would be particularly acceptable to him, so his favorite motto, whenever he spoke of maintaining, in spite of all opposition, the validity of the church-laws, and of punishing abuses, was, "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood," Jeremiah, 48 : 10.[1]

As the organs by which to extend and maintain his oversight over all the churches, and to exercise everywhere his juridical authority, he determined to make use of the institution of legates, which had been made a vital part of the papacy during the epoch of reform, in the times of Henry the Third. Since he could not be in all places at once, these legates were to act as his representatives and vicegerents, in upbuilding and destroying among the distant nations; and the bishops were to pay the same obedience to such legates as to the pope himself, and to stand by them in all cases; and he had the presumption to apply to this relation the words of our Lord to his apostles, declaring, that in them *he himself* was honored or despised.[2] At the same time, however, he did not allow these legates to act according to their own pleasure, but exercised a strict control over all their proceedings. He censured them, in right good earnest, if they failed to make an exact report of every matter to himself. He was a despot, determined to rule everywhere himself.[3] The gold which legates sent him, expecting by this means to pacify him, could not move him to release them from obligation to give in an exact account of all their transactions. To a certain legate, who contemplated something of this sort, he writes: "The fact that he had not personally brought in a report of all his proceedings admitted of no excuse, unless he was hindered by sickness, or had no possible means of returning." He reminded him of the fact, that he must have long since found out, how small store he (the pope) set by money, separate from the recognition of his authority.[4] Furthermore, the annual synods, during the fasts preceding Easter, which were attended by bishops from all parts of the Western church,[5] were to serve as a means of making the pope acquainted with the condition of all the churches, and of helping him to maintain an oversight

quam licenter si opus esset possumus, vobis proponimus.

[1] Lib. i, ep. 15: In eo loco positi sumus, ut velimus nolimus omnibus gentibus, maxime Christianis, veritatem et justitiam annuntiare compellamur; and now the passage: maledictus homo, qui prohibet gladium suum a sanguine, which he explains thus: verbum praedicationis a carnalium increpatione.

[2] Lib. v, ep. 2, regarding such a legate, whom he sent to Corsica: Ut ea, quae ad ordinem sacrae religionis pertinent, rite exequens juxta prophetae dictum evellat et destruat, aedificet et plantet. When, in Bohemia, the authority of these legates was disputed as an innovation, Gregory promptly gave them his support. He thus writes on this subject to the Bohemian bishops, l. i, ep. 17: Quidam vestrorum hoc quasi novum aliquid existimantes et non considerantes sententiam Domini dicentis: "qui vos recipit, me recipit, et qui vos spernit, me spernit." Legatos nostros contemptui habent ac proinde dum nullam debitam reverentiam exhibent, non eos, sed ipsam veritatis sententiam spernunt.

[3] Thus he took to task a legate whom he had sent to Spain, and who held a council there, because he had not either in person, or by one of his associates, made report to the pope (l. i, ep. 16): Quatenus perspectis omnibus confirmanda confirmaremus et si qua mutanda viderentur, discreta ratione mutaremus.

[4] Nam pecunias sine honore quanti pretii habeam, tu ipse optime dudum potuisti perpendere. Lib. vii, ep. 1.

[5] Two at least from each bishopric should take part therein. Lib. vii, ep. 1.

of their affairs. It is plain from many examples, how important he considered it to keep himself informed of the peculiarities, the particular condition and wants, even of the most distant nations, in order to meet their several necessities. Thus, for instance, he wrote to the king of Sweden, requesting him to send a bishop, or some ecclesiastic of suitable qualifications, to Rome, who could exactly inform him respecting the character of the country and the manners of the people, and who, after being fully instructed, could more safely convey back the papal ordinances to his native land.[1] To king Olof, of Norway, he wrote,[2] "that it would give him great pleasure, were it in his power, to send him qualified ecclesiastics for the instruction of his people; but as the remoteness of the country, and especially the want of a knowledge of the spoken language, rendered it extremely difficult to do this, he therefore requested him, as he had already done the king of Denmark, to send a few young people of the higher class to Rome, for the purpose of being accurately instructed there, under the protection of the apostles Peter and Paul, in the laws of God, so that they might convey back to their people the ordinances of the apostolical chair, and teach all they had learned to their countrymen, in their own language." On many occasions he showed how little he was to be influenced in the transaction of business, by money. A certain count of Angers, maintained an unlawful connection with a woman, and had for this reason been excommunicated by his bishop, whom he therefore persecuted; at the same time, however, he sent presents to the pope, hoping doubtless that by this course he should be able to conciliate his favor. The pope sent them all back; and wrote to the count that, until he had put away his sin, the head of the church could receive no presents from him, though he would not cease praying God to have mercy upon him.[3] The pious queen, Matilda of England, wrote to him, that anything of hers which he might wish, she was ready to give him. The pope answered her:[4] "What gold, what jewels, what precious objects of this world ought I to prefer to have from thee, rather than a chaste life, beneficence to the poor, love to God and to thy neighbor?" In a letter to the king of Denmark, the pope, with other exhortations, urgently called upon him to put a stop to that abuse, in his country, by which, in bad seasons and pestilences, innocent women were persecuted as witches who had brought about these calamities.[5] We have seen how a pope, by whom the papal authority was greatly increased, was the first to declare himself opposed to the employment of torture.[6] We see in the present case how the individual, by whose means the

[1] Lib. viii, ep. 1. Qui et terrae vestrae habitudines gentisque mores nobis suggerere et apostolica mandata de cunctis pleniter instructus ad vos certius queat referre.

[2] Lib. vi, ep. 13.

[3] Lib. ix, ep. 22. Munera tua ideo recipienda non esse arbitrati sumus, quia divinis oculis oblatio non acceptabilis esse probatur, quamdiu a peccato isto immunem te non reddideris et ad gratiam omnipotentis Dei non redieris.

[4] Lib. vii, ep. 26.

[5] Lib. vii, ep. 21. In mulieres ob eandem causam simili immanitate barbari ritus damnatas quidquam impietatis faciendi vobis fas esse nolite putare, sed potius discite, divinae ultionis sententiam digne poenitendo avertere, quam in illas insontes frustra feraliter saeviendo iram Domini multo magis provocare.

[6] Nicholas the First, in his letter to the Bulgarian princes; see vol. iii, p. 311.

papal monarchy was advanced to a still greater height than ever, declared himself opposed to a superstition, to which, in later times, by the trials for witchcraft, thousands must fall victims![1] In taking the preparatory steps for a synod of reform, to be held under the presidency of his legate in England, against certain abuses which had crept in, he called upon the bishops[2] to direct their attention and care particularly against the abuses of penance, and false confidence in priestly absolution: "For if one who had been guilty of murder, perjury, adultery, or any of the like crimes, persisted in such sins, or made traffic of them, which could hardly be done without sin, or bore weapons (except for the protection of his rights, or of his lord or friend, or of the poor, or for the defence of the church); or if one in so doing remained in possession of another's property, or harbored hatred of his neighbor; the penitence of such a person should in no-wise be considered as real and sincere. That was to be called a repentance without fruits, where one persisted in the same sin, or in a similar and worse one, or a triflingly less one. True repentance consisted in one's so turning back as to feel himself obliged to the faithful observance of his baptismal vow. Any other was sheer hypocrisy; and on none but him who did penance in the former of these ways, could he, by virtue of his apostolical authority, bestow absolution."

Highly, again, as Gregory prized monasticism, and the ascetical renunciation of the world; yet his predilection for this mode of life never moved him, in the case of such as could be more useful in the discharge of their functions in the position where God had placed them, and whose places could not easily be supplied, to approve the choice of this mode of life. The standard of love, he designated as the standard by which everything relating to this matter should be estimated. Accordingly, he wrote to the Margravine Beatrice and her daughter Mathilda:[3] "From love to God to show love to our neighbor; to aid the unfortunate and the oppressed; this I consider more than prayer, fasting, vigils, and other good works, be they ever so many; for true love is more than the other virtues." "For," he adds, "if this mother of all the virtues, which moved God to come down from heaven to earth to bear our sorrows, were not my teacher; and if there were any one, who would come forward in your place to help the oppressed churches, and serve the church universal; then would I exhort you to forsake the world with all its cares." In the same temper, he rebuked abbot Hugo of Cluny[4] for receiving a pious prince to his order of monks. "Why do you not bethink yourself," he wrote, "of the great peril in which the church now stands? Where are they, who, from love to God, are bold enough to stand firm against the impious, and to give up their lives for truth and justice? Behold! even such as seem to fear or to love God, flee from the battle of Christ, neglect the sal-

[1] We find also in Germany, even at this early period, the beginnings of the same mischief. In the year 1074, at Cologne, a woman whom people suspected to be a witch, was precipitated from the city wall, and killed. See Lambert of Aschaffenburg, at this year; ed. Krause, p. 136.

[2] Lib. vii, ep. 10.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 50.

[4] Lib. vi, ep. 17.

vation of their brethren, and, loving themselves only, seek repose." A hundred thousand Christians are robbed of their protection. Here and there, no doubt, God-fearing monks and priests are to be found; but a good prince is scarcely to be found anywhere. He admonishes him, therefore, to be more prudent for the future, and to esteem the love of God and of one's neighbor above all other virtues. Gregory shows the superior liberality of his views [1] in the judgment he passed on the difference in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's supper,[2] and also in his judgment relating to the controversy between the Greeks and Latins, concerning the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Lord's supper. True, it is his will, that the Latins should hold fast to their usage: yet he condemns not the Greeks, but applies in this case the words of Paul, "To the pure all things are pure." [3]

As Gregory had already when a cardinal made himself well known by principles so sharply defined, and so energetically carried out,[4] so the commencement of his papal administration would make a very different impression according to the relation in which the two opposite parties stood to each other. One of these parties expected from him the long-desired reformation of the church; the other dreaded the severe judge and punisher of the abuses which had crept in; bishops and monarchs might well tremble.[5] If the numerous party of bishops, who were interested in the maintaining of old abuses, had had time for that purpose, doubtless they would have opposed the election of Hildebrand at every step, such reactions having already proceeded from that party at the end of the preceding period.[6]

[1] We will by way of addition state this fact, also: The abbot Hugo of Cluny had inquired of the pope concerning Berengar. The answer could not perhaps be so easily and briefly given, as it would have been in case he could have declared him at once a false teacher: "De Berengario," he wrote in reply to abbot Hugo, "unde nobis scripsistis, quid nobis videatur, vel quid disposuerimus, fratres, quos tibi remittimus cum praedicto cardinali nostro, nuntiabunt." Epp. Gregor. l. v, ep. 21.

[2] See vol. iii, 494–510.

[3] Ipsorum fermentatum nec vituperamus nec reprobamus, sequentes apostolum dicentem mundis esse omnia munda. Lib. vii, ep. 1.

[4] His name, Gregory VII, while it contains an expression of his enduring friendship, implies also a protestation against the interference of the emperor in the affairs of the papacy.

[5] How he appeared to the pious men of his times, even such as did not belong to the zealots of the papal party, we may see from the judgment that Ordericus Vitalis of the monastery of St. Evreul, in Normandy, passes upon him; he says of him, ed. Du Chesne, f. 639: A puero monachus omnique vita sua sapientiae et religioni admodum studuit assiduumque certamen contra peccatum exercuit. Lambert, of Aschaffenburg, mentions him while he was yet a cardinal: Abbas de sancto Paulo, vir et eloquentia et sacrorum literarum eruditione valde admirandus; and page 89, in tota ecclesia omni virtutum genere celeberrimum.

[6] Worthy of notice is the account of Lambert of Aschaffenburg, p. 89. Gregory having become well known on account of his ardent zeal for the cause of God (zelo Dei ferventissimus), the French bishops were filled with great anxiety, ne vir vehementis ingenii et acris erga Deum fidei, districtius eos pro negligentiis suis quandoque discuteret, and they had therefore been very importunate with king Henry the Fourth, that he should declare the election which had taken place without his concurrence to be null and void; for, unless he anticipated the attack of the pope, the latter would come down upon no one with more severity than himself. Henry, therefore, immediately sent count Eberhard to Rome, with instructions to bring the Roman nobles to account for having, in contrariety to ancient usage, set up a pope without the concurrence of the king; and, in case it happened that Gregory would not give the proper satisfaction, to insist upon his abdication. The pope received him kindly, and called God to witness, that this dignity was forced upon him by the Romans; at the same time, however, his ordination was put off, till he should learn of the concur-

Gregory fulfilled these expectations. He convoked a synod to meet at Rome on the first fast-week of the year, whose business it should be to vindicate the freedom of the church, to promote the interests of religion, and to prevent an irremediable corruption which was coming upon the church. In the letters missive for this council,[1] he depicts in glaring colors, but in a way certainly not differing from the truth, the then corrupt condition of the church: that the princes, serving only their own selfish interests, setting all reverence aside, oppressed the church as a poor miserable handmaiden, and sacrificed her to the indulgence of their own desires. But the priests had entirely forgotten the obligations under which they were laid, by their holy vocation, to God, and to the sheep intrusted to their care; by their spiritual dignities, they only sought to attain to honor in the world; and the property, which was designed to subserve the benefit of many, was squandered away by them on idle state and in superfluous expenditures. And as the communities thus suffered under an entire want of instruction and guidance in righteousness; as, instead thereof, they could only learn from the example of those set over them what was contrary to Christianity, so *they* too gave themselves up to all wickedness; and not only the practical living out, but wellnigh all knowledge even, of the doctrines of faith was wanting.

At this fast-synod, in the year 1074, the principles were carried out, by which it had been already attempted, under the reigns of the recent popes, to improve the condition of the church, which had sunk so low. The repeated papal ordinances would still seem, however, to have accomplished nothing; in many countries they seem to have been as good as not known, as appears evident from the reception which the newly inculcated laws met with. Gregory not only repeated, at this synod, the ordinances against simony in the bestowment of benefices, and against matrimonial connections of the clergy, which he plainly

rence of the king and of the German princes. With this explanation, the king was satisfied, and so Gregory's consecration took place. Were we warranted to give any credit to this account, then Gregory's adroitness, in suiting his conduct to the circumstances, would have descended in this case to actual dishonesty; the end must have been thought by him to sanctify the means; for assuredly, according to Hildebrand's principles, the validity of a papal election could not be dependent on any such circumstances. Certain it is, that he was, from the first, determined to dispute such a position most decidedly. He must have yielded only for the moment, because he did not believe himself, as yet, strong enough to maintain his ground in a quarrel with the imperial party, or wished at least to guard against a dangerous schism. We must admit it to be not at all improbable, that such attempts might be made on Henry the Fourth by the anti-Hildebrandian party. But it is hardly possible to believe that Gregory, after having under the preceding reign so decidedly repelled any such concession, should have yielded so much as is here stated; for the consequences which might be drawn from his conduct in such a case, could be plainly foreseen. Moreover, the silence observed in the writings of the opposite party, which would not have failed to produce this fact against Gregory, if there had been any truth in it, bears testimony against the credibility of the story. Bishop Henry of Speier, who, in his ferocious letter against Gregory the Seventh (in Eccard. scriptores rer. Germ. t. ii, f. 762), would scarcely have omitted to make use of this along with his other charges against him, brings it against him simply, that when a cardinal he had bound himself by oath to the emperor, Henry the Third, never to accept the papal dignity, during his own or his son's lifetime, without his consent, nor to suffer that any other person should become pope without the same.

[1] Lib. i, ep. 42.

designates as "fornication;" he declared not only that those ecclesiastics, who had obtained their offices in the way just mentioned, and those who lived in such unlawful connections, were incapable henceforth of administering the functions of their office;[1] but he also addressed himself anew to the laity with a view to stir them up against the clergy who would not obey. "If, however, they resolve to persist in their sins," says he of those clergy, "then let no one of you allow himself to hear mass from them; for their blessing will be converted into a curse, their prayer into sin, as the prophet speaks: 'I will curse your blessings,'" Malach. 2: 12.[2] It was the pope's design, as he himself even avowed, to compel those ecclesiastics who would not obey from a sense of duty, to do so by exposing them to the detestation of the people.[3] Gregory, however, did not rest satisfied with merely having these laws published at the Roman synod; he also transmitted them to those bishops, who had not been present at the synod, making it at the same time imperative on them to see that they were put in force; and the legates, whom he sent forth in all directions, served as his agents to promulgate them everywhere, and to take care that they should be obeyed.

But the most violent commotions broke out in France and Germany, on the publication of the law against the marriage of the clergy. In this instance was displayed the resistance of the German spirit, some symptoms of which had already been manifested at the time of the planting of the German church by Boniface, against this attempt to curtail man of his humanity. It was as if an entirely new and unheard of law was promulgated; and the German spirit was prepared even now to feel the contradiction between this law and original Christianity, to contrast the declarations of Christ and the apostles with the arbitrary will of the pope. Such remonstrances as the following were uttered against the pope, in Germany:[4] "Forgetting the word of the Lord (Matt. 19: 11), as well as that of the apostle Paul (1 Corinth. 7: 9), he would force men, by tyrannical compulsion, to live as the angels; and by seeking to suppress the very dictates of nature, he was throwing open a wide door for all impurity of manners. Unless he withdrew these decrees, they would prefer rather to renounce the priesthood than their marriage-covenant; and then he, for whom men were not good enough, might look about for angels to preside over the churches."

The archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz wished to prepare his clergy by

[1] Si qui sunt presbyteri vel diaconi vel subdiaconi, qui in crimine fornicationis jaceant, interdicimus iis ex parte Dei omnipotentis et S. Petri auctoritate ecclesiae introitum, usque dum poeniteant et emendent.

[2] This ordinance is cited in this form by Geroch of Reichersberg, in Ps. x, Pez. l. c. t. v. f. 157. Mansi Concil, xx, f. 434.

[3] As he himself says in his letter to bishop Otto of Constance: Ut qui pro amore Dei et officii dignitate non corrigantur, verecundia seculi et objurgatione populi resipiscant.

[4] Lambert of Aschaffenburg, who did not himself belong to this anti-Hildebrandian party, in his History of Germany (at the year 1074), expresses himself in the following strong language: Adversus hoc decretum protinus vehementer infremuit tota factio clericorum, hominem plane haereticum et vesani dogmatis esse clamitans.

one step at a time. He allowed them half a year for consideration, exhorting them however, to undertake voluntarily that which they must otherwise do by constraint, and imploring them not to put him and the pope under the necessity of resorting to severer measures against them.[1] This indulgence, however, did not help the matter, for when the archbishop, at a synod held in Erfurt, in the month of October, required of the clergy that they should either separate from their wives, or resign their places, he met with the most violent resistance. In vain he declared to them that he did not act according to his own inclination, but was obliged to yield to the authority of the pope. They threatened him with deposition and death, if he persisted in carrying this measure through. He saw himself forced to let the matter rest for the present, and promised that he would make a report to the pope and try what could be done. Accordingly, he wrote to the pope, excusing himself on the ground of the impossibility, under the unfavorable circumstances, of showing obedience, as he wished, in all that the pope required. In this letter he says, "In regard to the chastity of the clergy and the crime of heresy, as well as everything else which you propose to me, I shall ever, so far as God gives me the ability, obey him and you. It would, however, correspond to apostolical gentleness, and fatherly love, so to modify your ecclesiastical ordinances, as that some regard might be had to the circumstances of the time and to that which is practicable in individual cases; so that, while there shall be no lack of strict discipline towards transgressors, there shall neither be any want of a charitable compassion towards those who are sick and need a physician; and that the measure of justice may not exceed the limits of apostolical prudence and paternal love."[2] But no excuses were availing with the pope. In an answer to two letters,[3] he replied to him[4] that, "no doubt, according to man's judgment, he had adduced weighty grounds of excuse; but nothing of all this could excuse him, however, before the Divine tribunal, for neglecting that which was requisite for the salvation of the souls committed to his care, — no loss of goods, no hatred of the wicked, no wrath of the powerful, no peril even of his life; for, to be ready to make all these sacrifices, was the very thing that distinguished the shepherd from the hireling." "It is a fact that must redound greatly to our shame," said the pope, in conclusion, "that the warriors of this world take their posts every day in the line of battle for their earthly sovereigns, and scarcely feel a fear of exposing their lives to hazard; and should not we, who are called priests of the Lord, fight for our king, who created all things

[1] See Lambert, p. 146.

[2] Erit autem apostolicae mansuetudinis et paternae dilectionis, sic ad fratres mandata dirigere ecclesiastica, ut et temporum opportunitates et singulorum possibilitatem dignemini inspicere, ut et deviantibus et discolis adhibeatur disciplina, quae debetur, et infirmis et opus habentibus medico compassio caritatis non negetur: saepeque examinatis negotiorum causis adhibeatur judicii censura, ut apostolicae discretionis et paternae pietatis modum non excedat justitiae mensura. Mansi Concil. xx, f. 434.

[3] In the second, he had excused himself on the ground that, under the existing circumstances, and on account of civil disputes and disturbances, he could not hold the required council of reform.

[4] Lib. iii, ep. 4.

from nothing, who cheerfully laid down his life for us, and who promises us eternal felicity?" And he persisted in requiring that the laws which had been passed respecting simony and the marriage of the clergy should at any rate be carried into effect, rejecting every modification on these points.[1] A second synod was held at Erfurt, at which a papal legate was present to enforce obedience. But he too came near losing his life in the tumult which ensued, and could accomplish nothing. The archbishop contented himself with ordering that *in future* none but unmarried persons should be elected to spiritual offices, and that at ordination every candidate should obligate himself to observe the law of celibacy.

The pope, who was soon informed of everything that transpired, by the multitudes who came from different regions to Rome,[2] learned that Gebhard, archbishop of Salzburg, although he had himself been present at the synod, yet let his clergy go on in the old way. For this, the pope addressed him a letter of sharp remonstrance.[3] In like manner he testified his displeasure to bishop Otto of Constance, about whom he had heard similar reports. "How should an ecclesiastic, living in concubinage," he asks, "be competent to administer the sacraments, when, in fact, such a person is not even worthy of receiving them; when the most humble layman, living in such unlawful connection, would certainly be excluded from the church-communion?"[4] He constantly assumed that marriage contracted by a clergyman, in defiance of the ecclesiastical laws, was nothing better than concubinage.

Gregory reckoned upon being upheld by the people; and he might, without advancing another step, simply leave his ordinances to operate among the people; here he would have found the most powerful support. As it had happened already, at the close of the preceding period,[5] the cause of the papacy against a corrupted clergy had now become the cause of the people. Gregory had, in fact, already appealed to the people, when he called on them not to accept the sacerdotal acts from ecclesiastics living in unlawful connections; while he at the same time exhibited their character in so hateful a light. He moreover made a direct call upon powerful laymen for their active coöperation in enforcing the obedience which should be rendered to those laws. Thus he wrote to those princes, on whose submission and interest, in behalf of the cause of piety, he thought he might safely rely.[6] He exhorted them, in the most urgent manner, to

[1] Hoc autem tuae fraternitati injungimus, quatenus de simoniaca haeresi ac fornicatione clericorum, sicut ab apostolica sede accepisti, studiose perquiras et quidquid retroactum inveneris, legaliter punias et funditus reseces: ac ne quidquid ulterius fiat, penitus interdicas.

[2] Lib. ix. ep. 1. Ab ipsis mundi finibus etiam gentes noviter ad fidem conversae student annue tam mulieres quam viri ad eum (S. Petrum) venire.

[3] Ut clericos, qui turpiter conversantur, pastorali vigore coërceas. Lib. i, ep. 30.

[4] Nos si vel extremum laicum pellicatui adhaerentem aliquando cognoverimus, hunc velut praecisum a dominico corpore membrum, donec poeniteat condigne a sacramento altaris arcemus, quomodo ergo sacramentorum distributor vel minister ecclesiae debet esse, qui nulla ratione debet esse particeps? Eccard, scriptores rer Germanicar. ii, ep. 142.

[5] See vol. iii, p. 398.

[6] Lib. ii, ep. 45, to the Duke Rudolph of Suabia, and Bertulph of Carinthia.

refuse accepting any priestly performance at the hands of clergy who had obtained their places by simony, or who lived in unchastity.[1] They were requested to publish these laws everywhere; and, if it should be necessary, hinder even by force such ecclesiastics from administering the sacraments.[2] They were not to be put at fault, if the bishops neglected their duty and kept silent, or even spoke against them.[3] If it should be objected to them, that this did not belong to their calling, still, they should not desist from laboring for their own and the people's salvation; they should, on the contrary, appeal to the pope, who had laid upon them this charge.[4] He himself says: "Since, by so many ordinances, from the time of Leo the Ninth, nothing has been effected,[5] it is far better to strike out a new path, than to let the laws sleep, and the souls of men perish also."[6] He had allied himself with the pious laity against the corrupted clergy; he expresses his joy that he had done so; and thanks God, that men and women of the lay order, notwithstanding the bad example of the clergy, were ready to give themselves up to the interests of piety. He calls upon such not to suffer themselves to be alarmed by the cry of the latter, who thought themselves entitled to despise such laymen, as ignorant persons.[7]

Again, Gregory found a peculiar kind of support in those monks, who travelled about as preachers of repentance, had the greatest influence among the people, and sided with the popes in combating the prevailing corruption of manners, and the vicious clergy. There were some among these, inflamed by the ardor of genuine piety; but there were others inspired only by fanaticism or ambition.[8] Hence,

[1] Vos officium eorum, quos aut simoniace promotos et ordinatos aut in crimine fornicationis jacentes cognoveritis, nullatenus recipiatis.

[2] Et haec eadem adstricti per obedientiam tam in curia regis quam per alia loca et conventus regni notificantes ac persuadentes, quantum potestis, tales sacrosanctis deservire mysteriis, etiam vi, si oportuerit, prohibeatis.

[3] Quidquid episcopi dehinc loquantur aut taceant.

[4] Si qui autem contra vos quasi istud officii vestri non esse, aliquid garrire incipiant, hoc illis respondete: ut vestram et populi salutem non impedientes, de injuncta vobis obedientia ad nos nobiscum disputaturi veniant.

[5] Concerning those laws: Quae cum sancta et apostolica mater ecclesia jam a tempore b. Leonis papae saepe in conciliis tum per legatos tum per epistolas in se et commissas sibi plebes, utpote ab antiquioribus neglecta, renovare et observare commonuerit, rogaverit et accepta per Petrum auctoritate jusserit, adhuc inobedientes, exceptis perpaucis, tam execrandam consuetudinem nulla studuerunt prohibitione decidere, nulla districtione punire.

[6] Multo enim melius nobis videtur, justitiam Dei vel novis reaedificare consiliis, quam animas hominum una cum legibus deperire neglectis.

[7] Lib. ii, ep. 11. Quapropter quidquid illi contra vos imo contra justitiam garriant et pro defendenda nequitia sua vobis, qui illiterati estis, objiciant, vos in puritate et constantia fidei vestrae permanentes, quae de episcopis et sacerdotibus simoniacis aut in fornicatione jacientibus ab apostolica sede accepistis, firmiter credite et tenete. In a letter which is addressed to the bishop and the communities at the same time, he calls upon both to labor together for the same object. Lib. ii, ep. 55.

[8] When the decrees of that Roman council were made known at a synod held in Paris, nearly all the bishops, abbots, and clergy protested against them, declaring, importabilia esse praecepta idcoque irrationabilia. Walter, abbot of the monastery of St. Martin, near Pontisara (Pontoise), the fierce antagonist of simony, who fearlessly told the truth to king Philip the First, was the only one who stood up for these laws, on the principle of the respect which in every case was due to superiors. Churchmen and people of the court attacked him on all sides; but he was not to be moved by any authority nor by any

the monks drew upon themselves, as a class, the hatred of the anti-Hildebrandian party. They were represented by the men who stood at the head of that party, as pharisees, promoters of spiritual darkness, and zealots for human ordinances.[1] In the anti-Hildebrandian party we must distinguish two classes: those who, contending only for their own personal advantage and the maintenance of old abuses, were farthest removed from the interest of culture; and those who strove for the cause of a well-grounded conviction, — representatives of a freer spirit,[2] which they had contracted from the study of the Bible, and of the older church-teachers, and which would incite them to push their studies still further in the same direction. To such, the monks contending for the Hildebrandian system might well appear to be no better than *Obscurantists*.

Thus Gregory must unite himself with the monks against the bishops as well as against the princes. We see how he takes the part of the former against that free-minded bishop, Cunibert of Turin;[3] and it may be a question on which side the right was in this dispute; whether the quarrel was not connected with the universal contest about principles which agitated these times. Remarkable is the language which Gregory, in a threatening tone, addresses to this bishop, that "the earlier popes had made pious monasteries free from all relations of dependence on the bishops, and bishoprics free from the oversight of the metropolitans, in order to protect them against the

threats. See his Life, written by one of his disciples; c. ii, § 10, t. i, Mens. April, f. 760. Even down to the early part of the twelfth century, to the time of pope Paschalis the Second, the papal laws of celibacy were so little observed in Normandy, that priests celebrated their weddings openly, passed their livings to their sons by inheritance, or gave them as a dowry to their daughters, if they had no other property. Before they married, they took an oath to their wives, in the presence of their parents, that they would never forsake them. When, however, the monk Bernard (abbot of Tira in the diocese of Chartres), itinerated at that time in Normandy as a preacher of repentance, being a man of true piety, who had great influence on the people, he stood forth in opposition to such ecclesiastics and sharply rebuked them in his discourses. Some gave heed to his exhortations, but the greater number continued to pursue their old course of life. The wives of the priests with their whole retinue, and the clergy themselves, persecuted him. They tried to bring it about that he should be forbidden to preach. See the Life of this man, at April 14, c. vi, § 51, t. ii. f. 234.

[1] The fierce opponent of the Hildebrandian party, and zealous champion for the cause of the emperor Henry the Fourth, bishop Waltram of Naumburg, attacked the monks as pharisees, (*Obscurantes*), who zealously contended for human traditions, prevented instruction in their monasteries, and sought to keep the youth, from the first, in ignorance and stupidity. Mirandum est valde, quod nolunt aliqui, praecipue autem monachi, quae praeclara sunt discere, qui ne pueros quidem vel adolescentes permittunt in monasteriis habere studium salutaris scientiae, ut scilicet rude ingenium nutriatur siliquis daemoniorum, quae sunt consuetudines humanarum traditionum, ut ejusmodi spurcitiis assuefacti non possint gustare, quam suavis est Dominus, qui dicit in evangelio de talibus: vae vobis scribae et pharisaei hypocritae, vos enim non intratis, nec sinitis introeuntes intrare. Apolog. lib. ii, p. 170, in Goldast. Apol. pro Henrico Quarto. Hanoviae. 1611.

[2] Gerhoh of Reichersberg complains of the wresting of the Scriptures which the defenders of simony and of Nicolaitism (as the defence of the marriage of priests was termed) resorted to: Ipsi Simoniaci et Nicolaitae obtinuerunt divitias corporales et spirituales, nam possident ecclesias et sciunt scripturas et *ideo de ipsis scripturis et novi testamenti* intenderunt arcum ad se detorquendo et flectendo sensum eorum juxta errorem suum. It is evident, then, that the educated men of the anti-Hildebrandian party took pains to study the Bible; and what Gerhoh calls wresting of the Scriptures, was sometimes the right interpretation of the Bible.

[3] See vol. iii, p. 383.

enmity of their superiors, so that they might ever stand free, and immediately connected, as more illustrious members, with the head, the apostolical see.[1] Here we discern that tendency of papal absolutism, which was seeking to dissolve the existing legitimate gradation of the church organism, and to procure organs everywhere which should be immediately dependent on and serviceable to itself. It was made therefore a special matter of reproach against Gregory the Seventh, by the defenders of the opposite system, — that he paid no regard whatever to the specific rights of any ecclesiastical authority.[2]

But the passions of the people having once been excited against the clergy, there arose, to a still greater extent than we observe on the like occasion in any former period, separatist movements, and the passions of the people went beyond the limits fixed by the popes. Laymen stood forth who, while they declared the sacraments administered by the corrupted clergy to be without validity, took the liberty themselves to baptize. We may well believe, too, the remark of a historian, of this period,[3] hostilely disposed to this pope, that, in a state of the nations which still continued to be so rude, the fanaticism excited by the pope against the married clergy, manifested itself in the wildest outbreaks, and even led to a profanation of the sacraments. Heretical tendencies might easily spring up out of this insurrection against the corrupted clergy and this separatism, or find in them a point of attachment. It was an easy thing for all, who understood how to take advantage of the excited feelings of the people, to use them for their own ends, and as a means to obtain followers. Certain it is, that the heretical sects, which in the twelfth century spread with so much power, especially in Italy, were by this ferment not a little promoted,[4] as the sectarian name of the Patarenes[5] itself indicates. The demagogical tendency was especially objected to the pope by his adversaries; and it was said, that he made use of the popular fury as a means of procuring obedience to his laws.[6]

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 69. Perpetua libertate donantes apostolicae sedi velut principalia capiti suo membra adhaerere sanxerunt.

[2] See the letter of the bishop of Speier against Gregory: Sublata quantum in te fuit, omni potestate episcopis, quae eis divinitus per gratiam Spiritus sancti collata esse dinoscitur, dum nemo jam alicui episcopus aut presbyter est, nisi qui hoc indignissima assentatione a fastu tuo emendicavit. See Eccard, l. c. ii, f. 762.

[3] See the remarks of Sigebert of Gembloux, cited below.

[4] This may be gathered even from the remarkable account of the historian Sigebert of Gembloux. Continentiam paucis tenentibus, aliquibus eam modo causa quaestus ac jactantiae simulantibus, multis incontinentiam perjuro (since they put themselves under an obligation, at their ordination, to observe the laws of celibacy, and yet were not enabled to keep it), cumulantibus ad hoc hac opportunitate laicis insurgentibus contra sacros ordines, et se ab omni ecclesiastica subjectione excutientibus, laici sacra mysteria temerant et de his disputant, infantes baptizant, sordido humore aurium pro sacro oleo et chrismate utentes, in extremo vitae viaticum dominicum et usitatum ecclesiae obsequium sepulturae a presbyteris conjugatis accipere parvi pendunt, decimas presbyteris deputatas igni cremant, et ut in uno caetera perpendas, laici corpus Domini a presbyteris conjugatis consecratum, saepe pedibus conculcaverunt et sanguinem Domini voluntarie effuderunt, et multa alia contra jus et fas in ecclesia gesta sunt, et hac occasione *multi pseudomagistri* exurgentes in ecclesia, *profanis novitatibus plebem ab ecclesiastica disciplina avertunt*. Although this account, as proceeding from an opponent of the Hildebrandian party, might excite suspicion, yet certainly in all essential points it is in conformity with the truth.

[5] See vol. iii, p. 393.

[6] In the letter of Theodoric of Verdun: Legem de clericorum incontinentia per lai

How easily the people, in a time of barbarism, might pass over from a superstitious veneration of the clergy to a fanatical detestation of them, may be seen from the example in Denmark, which perhaps was connected with these movements excited by the pope himself. The people, on occasions of public calamity, a bad atmosphere, pestilences, failure of crops, were wont to complain of the clergy, and to rage against them; hence, the pope himself was under the necessity of exhorting them to show a becoming reverence to the priests.[1]

All this now furnished grounds for various complaints against the pope. Even those who approved the laws respecting celibacy, in themselves considered, still could not approve the means which he employed to enforce obedience to them; and they thought he ought to have been content to establish these laws on a firm foundation for the future, and to enforce obedience to them in all following time. But they found fault with him, because he showed no indulgence to those clergymen who were already bound by the ties of wedlock, because he was for having everything done at once, and paid no regard to the weakness of mankind; because he did not copy the example of Christ, in bearing with the infirmities of his disciples; because he was for pouring the new wine into old bottles, and stirring up the people so cruelly against the clergy. By all the laws in the world, said they, that cannot possibly be brought about by force which grace alone can effect by working from within. Hence every good man should be more ready to pray for the weak, than to involve them in such persecutions.[2]

Furthermore, the manner in which Gregory had expressed himself respecting the sacramental acts performed by unworthy ecclesiastics, gave occasion to the charge, that he made the validity and force of the sacraments depend on the subjective character of the priest: which stood at variance with the doctrine concerning the objective validity of the sacraments recognized ever since the controversies between Cyprian and the Church of Rome.[3]

corum insanias cohibenda, legem ad scandalum in ecclesia mittendum tartaro vomente prolatam. Martene et Durand, thes. nov. anecdotor. t. i, f. 218. And Henry, bishop of Speier, says, in the letter above cited: Omnis rerum ecclesiasticarum administratio *plebejo furori* per te attributa.

[1] His way of doing this, discovers, in a characteristic manner, the more Jewish than Christian position on which he stood. Quod quam grave peccatum sit, ex eo liquido potestis advertere, quod Judaeis etiam sacerdotibus ipse salvator noster lepra purgatos eis mittendo honorem exhibuerit caeterisque servandum esse quae illi dixissent, praecepit, quum profecto vestri qualescunque habeantur, tamen illis longe sint meliores. Lib. vii, ep. 21.

[2] The words of priest Alboin, in his second letter against priest Bernold of Constance: Nonne etiam ipse summus pontifex, qui coelos penetravit, non omnes hoc verbum castitatis capere, neque etiam novum mustum in veteres uteres fundi convenire, insuper rudes discipulos, quamdiu cum illis sponsus est, non jejunare profitetur, infirmitatibus nostris misericorditer compati non dedignatur. As Christ, the great physician, received publicans and sinners among his table companions. But one will say: Yes, after they manifested repentance. Well, but who brought them to repentance? Assuredly, Christ alone. Profecto filius hominis, qui de coelo descendit, Zachaeo sui occulta inspiratione adscensionem arboris persuasit. Sic etiam nunc, nisi ille *omnia trahens ad se occulto suae gratiae metu nos miseros trahat, procul dubio nostri Papae* auctoritas vacillat. Agnum cum lupo vesci confitetur dextera excelsi. Proinde quemque piorum magis deceret pro infirmis orare, quam in istis malis diebus *tot persecutorum* super eos jugum ducere. Ed. Goldast. l. c. pag. 42.

[3] See Waltram of Naumburg, l. iii, c. 3. Gerhoh of Reichersberg takes great pains

Although those first ordinances of the pope had already excited so violent a ferment, he yet, unmoved by that circumstance, proceeded to take another step. In order to cut off entirely the fountain-head of simony, and to deprive the secular power of all influence in the appointments to spiritual offices,[1] the *right* of *investiture*, by virtue of which the laity might always exercise a certain influence of this sort, was to be wholly denied them. At a second fast-synod of reform, held at Rome the year 1075, he issued the ordinance: "If any person in future accepts a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman, such person shall not be regarded as a bishop or an abbot, nor shall he enter a church, till he has given up the place thus illegally obtained. The same thing should hold good also of the lower church offices. And every individual, be he emperor or king, who bestows investiture in connection with such an office, should be excluded from church-communion."[2] Gregory and his party maintained that on this point also they only restored to the ancient ecclesiastical laws the authority which belonged to them; that being reduced to practice, which these laws had determined with regard to the freedom of church elections. He was praised as the restorer of free church elections; and men were indebted to him for the rescue of the church from utter ruin, which venality, and hence bad appointments to all offices, from the highest to the lowest, must have for their consequence.[3] By the other party, however, it was made out, in defence of the rights of monarchs, that if the bishops and abbots were willing to receive from them civil immunities and possessions, they must also bind themselves to the fulfilment of the duties therewith connected. This was the beginning of a long-continued contest between the papacy and the secular power.

to defend the pope against the accusation of those who said: Non potest pollui verbum Dei, non potest impediri gratia Dei, quin suos effectus operetur, etiam per ministros, Judae traditori similes. He grants this to be true in reference to those whose vices are not yet openly known; but the case is different, he maintains, after such worthless clergymen have been deposed by the pope; just as Judas, after he had become exposed, and had left the ranks of the disciples, no longer took part with them in any religious act. See l. c. pag. 154 seq. We see from what he says, how much talk there was at that time on this subject on both sides. In a much more able manner than Gerhoh, Anselm of Canterbury defends at one and the same time, the objective validity of the sacraments and the papal law, the sense of which was not, quo quis ea, quae tractant, contemnenda, sed tractandos execrandos existimet, ut qui Dei et Angelorum praesentiam non reverentur, vel hominum detestatione repulsi, sacra contaminare desistant. Lib. i, ep. 56.

[1] See vol. iii, pp. 382, 394, and 403.

[2] See this decree in the work which that zealous defender of Gregory's course, Anselm, bishop of Lucca, wrote against his adversary Guibert. T. iii, p. i, lib. ii, f. 383. Canis. lect. antiq. ed. Basnage.

[3] Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who wrote after the middle of the twelfth century, reckons the restoration of free ecclesiastical elections among the works of the Holy Spirit in his times. Haec sunt pia de spiritu pietatis provenientia spectacula, cujus operationi et hoc assignamus, quod in diebus istis magna est libertas canonicis electionibus episcoporum, abbatum, praepositorum, et aliarum ecclesiasticarum personarum provehendarum in dignitatibus, quas per multos annos paene a temporibus Ottonis primi, imperatoris usque ad imperatorem Henricum quartum, vendere solebant ipsi reges vel imperatores regnante ubique simonia, dum per simoniacos episcopos in cathedra pestilentiae positos mortifera illa pestis dilata est usque ad infimos plebanos et capellanos, per quos valde multiplicatos (see vol. iii, p. 109, and 412), *ecclesia paene tota foedabatur*, usque ad Gregorium septimum, qui se opposuit murum pro domo Is-

The above-mentioned decrees the pope now sought to carry into execution against princes and prelates. He threatened the young Philip the First, of France, with excommunication, the interdict, and deposition, if he refused to reform. In a letter to the French bishops,[1] he describes the sad condition of France, where no rights, human or divine, were respected, where rapine and adultery reigned with impunity.[2] He made it a matter of severest reproach to the bishops, that they did not restrain the king from such acts. They had not a shadow of excuse to plead. They were much mistaken, if they supposed, that they acted against the oath of fidelity which they had taken, when they prevented him from sinning; for it was a far greater act of fidelity to rescue another against his own will from making shipwreck of his soul, than by an injurious acquiescence to allow him to perish in the vortex of his guilt. The plea of fear could not excuse them in the least; for if they were united in each other in defending justice and right, they would have such power, that, without any danger whatsoever, they might draw him from all his accustomed vices, and at the same time deliver their own souls; although, to say truth, not even the fear of death should hinder them from discharging the duties of their priestly vocation. If the king would not listen to their representations, they should then renounce all fellowship with him, and impose the interdict on all France. And at the same time, Gregory declared: "Let every man know that, should the king even then show no signs of repentance, he would, with God's help, take every measure within his reach to wrest the kingdom of France from his hands."[3]

Hermann, bishop of Bamberg, (a man who lacked every other qualification as well as the knowledge required by his office),[4] formerly vice-dominus at Mentz, had in the year 1065, with a large sum of money, procured for himself the episcopal dignity in Bamberg.[5] In vain did this man try to deceive the pope by professions of repentance. In vain did his friend, archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz, go in person to Rome, and use all his influence to soften the feelings of the pope towards him. He had to be content that no worse punishment befell himself; that he was not himself put out of his office, because he had ordained that bishop. The pope commanded him to withdraw himself from all fellowship with the bishop of Bamberg, to publish the papal sentence of excommunication against him in all Germany, and to see

raël, reparando in ecclesia canonicas electiones juxta pristinas canonum sanctiones. In Ps. 39, l. c. f. 793.

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 5.

[2] Quod nusquam terrarum est, cives, propinqui, fratres etiam alii alios propter cupiditatem capiunt et omnia bona eorum ab illis extorquentes, vitam in extrema miseria finire faciunt.

[3] Nulli clam aut dubium esse volumus, quin modis omnibus regnum Franciae de ejus occupatione, adjuvante Deo, tentemus eripere.

[4] A remarkable illustration of his ignorance is a case cited by Lambert of Aschaffenburg, A. D. 1075, p. 154. When the clerus of Bamberg, taking advantage of the authority of the papal legate, rose in resistance against their bishop, a young clergyman stood forth and declared, that if the bishop showed himself able to translate, word for word, a single verse from the Psalter, they would acknowledge him as bishop on the spot.

[5] See Lambert, l. c. p. 44.

to it, that another should be elected as soon as possible. No other hope now remaining to bishop Hermann, he proceeded himself, with advocates to defend his cause, to Rome, intending to effect his object by intrigue and bribery. But he dared not appear personally before the pope.[1] He endeavored to carry on his cause in Rome simply by his money and his lawyers. But he found himself disappointed in his expectations. Gregory was inaccessible to such influences. And it is a proof of the power which he exercised over all that were about him, that even at the Roman court, arts of bribery, which at other times had been so common and so successful here, could now effect nothing.[2] No other way, therefore, remained for him, but unconditional submission to the irrevocable judgment of the pope. He obtained only the assurance of the papal absolution, on promising that, after his return, he would retire to a monastery, for the purpose of there doing penance. But when he came back, the manner in which he had been treated by the pope excited great indignation in the knights who espoused his cause. They called it an unheard-of thing, that the pope, without any regular trial, should presume to depose a high spiritual dignitary of the empire. The bishop now threw himself upon these knights, who were his only reliance, and treated the papal excommunication as null. Yet all others avoided intercourse with him as an excommunicated person. None would receive from him any sacerdotal act, and he could only decide on questions of secular property. The pope pronounced on him the anathema; and as he finally succeeded in having another bishop appointed, Hermann was obliged to yield. The deposed bishop, driven by necessity, retired to the monastery of Schwartzach in the territory of Würzburg, and then went with the abbot of this convent to Rome. Now for the first time the pope bestowed upon him absolution, and gave him permission to perform sacerdotal functions, with the understood condition, however, that he was ever to remain excluded from the episcopal dignity.

King Henry, who most favored the abuses attacked by the pope by an administration wholly surrendered to arbitrary will, was induced on account of his then political situation to yield compliance. Through the mediation of his pious mother Agnes, a reconciliation took place between him and the pope; he dismissed the ministers, on whom, because they encouraged simony, excommunication had been pronounced, and expressed a willingness to obey the pope in all things, so that the latter signified his entire satisfaction with him, and the best

[1] From Lambert's words, l. c. p. 156, we should infer, it is true, that he himself had come to Rome. But it is evident from a letter of pope Gregory, that he did not execute this resolution. In the letter to king Henry, lib. iii, ep. 3: Simoniacus ille Herimannus dictus episcopus hoc anno ad synodum Romam vocatus venire contemsit; sed cum propius Romam accessisset, in itinere substitit.

[2] Lambert of Aschaffenburg says rightly: Sed Romani pontificis constantia et invictus adversus avaritiam animus omnia excludebat argumenta humanae fallaciae, which is confirmed by Gregory's way of expressing himself on the subject: Praemittens nuntios suos cum copiosis muneribus noto sibi artificio innocentiam nostram et confratrum nostrorum integritatem pactione pecuniae attentare atque, si fieri posset, corrumpere molitus est. Quod ubi praeter spem evenit, etc.

hopes for the future. Already Gregory was employed, during this momentary interval of peace, in sketching the outlines of a great plan, for the execution of which he invited the coöperation of king Henry. The idea of a crusade, first broached by Silvester the Second, was now taken up again by him. We have observed how Gregory lamented over the separation of the Western from the Eastern church, and the sad condition of Oriental Christendom, overrun by the Saracens. He had been invited from the East to procure the assistance of the West in behalf of the oppressed Christian brethren of the East. The hope was opened out to him, of liberating the holy places from the yoke of the infidels, of once more uniting together the East and the West in one community of faith and church-fellowship, and of thus extending his spiritual prerogative over the former as well as the latter. Fifty thousand men were already prepared to march under his priestly direction to the East.[1] "Since our fathers," he wrote, "have, for the confirmation of the Catholic faith, often trod those countries, so will we, sustained by the prayers of all Christians, if under the leading of Christ the way shall be opened to us, — for it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps, but the ordering of our ways is of the Lord, — for the sake of the same faith and for the defence of Christians go thither also." And in communicating this purpose to king Henry, he asked his counsels and support; he would during his absence commend the Roman church to his protection. But soon Gregory became involved in violent disputes, which no longer permitted him to think of executing so vast a plan.

The young king Henry, following his own inclinations, would be more ready to agree with the opponents of the Hildebrandian system, than with its adherents; for Gregory's severity could not possibly be agreeable to him; and men were not wanting who wished to make use of him as a bulwark against the rigid, inflexible pope, and these invited him to assert against the latter his sovereign power. His uncertain political situation had procured admission for the remonstrances of his mother and other mediators. But after he had conquered Saxony, these restraints vanished away. The pope heard, that the emperor continued, in an arbitrary manner, to fill vacant bishoprics in Italy and Germany; and that he had again drawn around him the excommunicated ministers. After Gregory found that he had been deceived by many of Henry's specious words, he wrote him in the year 1075, as the last trial of kindness, a threatening letter, couched in language of paternal severity, but at the same time tempered with gentleness. The spirit in which he wrote was expressed already in the superscription:[2] "Gregory to king Henry, health and apostolical blessing; that is, in case he obeys the apostolical see, as becomes a Christian prince." With such a proviso — the letter began — had he bestowed on him the apostolical blessing, because the report was

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 31. Jam ultra quinquaginta millia ad hoc se praeparant, ut si me possunt in expeditione pro duce ac pontifice habere, armata manu contra inimicos Dei volunt insurgere, et usque ad sepulchrum Domini ipso ducente pervenire.

[2] Lib. iii ep. 10.

abroad, that he knowingly held fellowship with persons excommunicated. If this were the case, he himself must perceive, that he could not otherwise expect to share the divine and apostolical blessing, than as he separated himself from the excommunicated, inciting them to repentance, and rendered himself worthy of absolution by affording the satisfaction that was due. If, therefore, he felt himself to be guilty in this matter, he should quickly apply for advice to some pious bishop, confess his fault to him; and the bishop, with the concurrence of the pope, could impose a suitable penance, and bestow absolution on him.[1] He next complains of the contradiction between his fair professions and his actions. In reference to the law against investiture, concerning which the pope had been informed that the king had many difficulties,[2] he declared, it is true, once more, that he had merely restored the old ecclesiastical laws to their rights; yet he professed himself ready to enter into negotiations on that subject, through pious men, with the king, and[3] to mitigate so far the severity of the law in compliance with their advice, as could be done consistently with the glory of God and the spiritual safety of the king.

The pope had said nothing in this letter which, according to *his* mode of looking at things, could offend the king's dignity. He looked upon it as a principle universally valid, that high and low should in like manner be subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. He could not foresee that Henry, after having so shortly before, at least in his professions, acknowledged so entire a submission to the papal see, would receive such a letter, in which he himself held out his hand for peace, with such violent indignation.[4] But as appears evident from the let-

[1] Qui cum nostra licentia congruam tibi pro hac culpa injungens poenitentiam te absolvat, ut nobis tuo consensu modum poenitentiae tuae per epistolam suam veraciter intimare audeat.

[2] Decretum, quod quidam dicunt importabile pondus et immensam gravitudinem.

[3] Ne pravae consuetudinis mutatio te commoveret.

[4] According to the account of the German historian, Lambert of Aschaffenburg, there was, to be sure, something else of a special character, which so exasperated the feelings of the king towards the pope, and which had in some sense compelled him, unless he was willing to be completely humbled before the pope, to anticipate the blow which he was to receive from Rome. The pope had sent an embassy to him, through which he cited him to appear before the Roman synod of Lent, on the Monday of the second week of Lent, A. D. 1076, where he was to clear himself of the charges which had been brought against him, with the threat that, if he did not comply, the ban would be pronounced on him the same day. The above-mentioned letter of the pope, however, contradicts the supposition of any such embassy. Some important occurrence must have intervened, which led the pope to deviate so far from the paternal tone which he had expressed in this letter. The thing, after all, remains quite improbable. We may perhaps consider the embassy mentioned by this historian as the same with that which was the bearer of the above-mentioned letter; and in this case, we must explain the contents of the message delivered by this embassy in accordance with the letter itself. From the letter, it follows, to be sure, that if Henry did not act in the way required of him by the pope, he had to expect excommunication; and from this, the story just related may have grown. Were the statement, as we find it given by this historian, the correct one, the defenders of Gregory could never have appealed to the fact, that Henry had attacked the pope without any previous provocation, and that this first violent step was the source of all the ensuing evil. Thus, the language of Gebhard, bishop of Salzburg, to Hermann, bishop of Metz, is: "The adherents of Henry could not excuse themselves on the ground, that they at first had only adopted measures of defence against the pope." Nam apostolicae animadversionis, qua se injuriatos causantur, ipsi potius causa ex-

ter of the pope addressed to the Germans themselves,[1] he afterwards sent to him three men, natives of countries subject to the emperor, who were directed privately to reprove him for his transgressions, exhort him to repentance, and represent to him, that if he did not reform, and shun all intercourse with the excommunicated, he might expect excommunication; and that then, as a thing which, according to the Hildebrandian notions of ecclesiastical law, followed necessarily upon excommunication, he would no longer be competent to administer the government. Henry, in his existing state of mind, was little capable of enduring such a mode of treatment as this. He dismissed the envoys in an insulting manner; and an accidental circumstance contributed perhaps to induce him to venture on a step, which was by no means justified in the then existing forms of law, but by which he hoped he might be able to rid himself at once of so annoying an overseer. A certain cardinal, Hugo Blancus, whom pope Alexander the Second, and indeed Gregory himself, had employed on embassies, but who, for reasons unknown, had become the pope's most bitter enemy, and whom Hildebrand had deposed,[2] came to the emperor and handed over to him a violent complaint against the pope. The king now issued letters missive for an assembly of his spiritual and secular dignitaries, to be held at Worms on the Sunday of *Septuagesima*, A. D. 1076. These letters invited them to come to the rescue not merely of his own insulted dignity, but also of the interests of all the bishops, the interests of the whole oppressed church. In this writing he even accuses the pope, probably on the ground of the above-mentioned rumor, of having obtained possession of the papal dignity in an unlawful manner.[3] He requires of the bishops, that they should stand by him in a distress, which was not his alone, but the common distress of all the bishops, and of the whole oppressed church. It was the common interest of the empire and of the priesthood; for the pope had, notwithstanding Christ's direction that the two swords, the spiritual and the secular, the two powers,[4] should be separated from each

titerunt, et unde se accensos conqueruntur, hoc ipsi potius incenderunt ideoque injurias non tam retulerunt quam intulerunt. Cum enim primum ad initiandam hanc rem Wormatiae confluxissent, ubi omnis, quam patimur, calamitas exordium sumsit, nullam adhuc Dominus Papa excommunicationis vel anathematis sententiam destinavit, sed ipsi, primitiae discordiarum, ipso ignorante et nihil minus putante, praelationi suae superba et repentina temeritate abrenuntiaverunt. Gebhard then seeks to prove this by the chronology of events. When Henry celebrated the festival of St. Andrew in Bamberg, shortly before Christmas, there was still so good an understanding between the emperor and the pope, that the former acted entirely according to the determinations of the latter in displacing the bishop of Bamberg. Quid ergo tam cito intercidere potuit, ut ille, qui in proximo ante nativitatem Domini tantae in ecclesia magnificentiae fuit, ut ad nutum illius dignitatum mutationes fierent, idem paucis post nativitatem diebus inconventus, inauditus totius etiam ignarus dissensionis proscriberetur? Ed. Tengnagel, pp. 28–29.

[1] Praeterea misimus ad eum tres religiosos viros, suos utique fideles, per quos eum secreto monuimus, ut poenitentiam ageret de suis sceleribus.

[2] Lambert says: Quem ante paucos dies propter ineptiam et mores inconditos papa de statione sua amoverat.

[3] Invasoris violentia.

[4] Concerning the spiritual sword, it is said that, by means of it, men were to be compelled to obey the king next to God. The pope, therefore, ought to unite with the king in punishing those who disobeyed the latter. Videlicet sacerdotali gladio ad obedientiam regis post Dominum homines constringendos.

other, sought to usurp both for himself. He meant to let no man be a priest, who did not sue for it at his own footstool; and because the king regarded his royal power as received solely from God, and not from the pope, he had threatened to deprive him of his government and of his soul's salvation.

The council, which met on the Sunday of Septuagesima, January 24, 1076, on the ground of the charges brought against the pope by the cardinal Hugo Blancus, pronounced sentence of deposition upon Gregory: and, which shows to what extent these bishops and abbots were willing to be employed as the blind tools of power, and how much they needed a severe regent at the head of the church, notwithstanding the irregular procedure of this assembly, notwithstanding the scruples which, according to the ecclesiastical views of that period, must have arisen against it in the minds of the clergy, not a man amongst them all uttered a word against it. Two only, Adalbero bishop of Würzburg, and Hermann bishop of Metz, protested against the irregularity of this proceeding. They objected to it, in the first place, on the general principle, that no bishop, without a previous regular trial, without the proper accusers and witnesses, and without proof of the charges brought against him, could be deposed; and least of all could this be done in the case of the pope, against whom no bishop or archbishop could appear as an accuser.

It was considered a duty of loyalty to the king, to acquiesce in this decision. In order to bind the members of the assembly, Henry caused a written oath to be taken by each, that he would no longer recognize Gregory as pope. This judgment having been passed, Henry announced it to the pope in a letter, addressed as follows: "Henry, king by the grace of God and not by the will of man, to Hildebrand, no longer apostolical, but a false monk;" and the letter concluded with the words — "this sentence of condemnation having been pronounced upon you by us and all our bishops, descend from the apostolical chair you have usurped; let another mount the chair of Peter, who will not cloak deeds of violence under religion, but set forth the sound doctrines of St. Peter. I, Henry, and all our bishops, bid you come down, come down." Moreover, in this letter, it was alleged against the pope, that he had attacked the divine right by which kings are appointed, and that he sought to degrade all prelates to the position of his servants, *and stirred up the people against the clergy*.[1] At the same time, Henry addressed a letter to the cardinals and to the Roman people, calling upon them to acquiesce in this sentence, and to sustain the election of a new pope. An ecclesiastic of Parma, by the name of Roland,[2] was selected to convey these letters to Rome, and to announce to the pope the judgment passed upon him.

Shortly before this storm came upon the pope, he had been delivered

[1] Rectores ecclesiae sicut servos sub pedibus tuis calcasti, in quorum conculcatione tibi favorem ab ore vulgi comparasti. Laicis ministerium super sacerdotes usurpasti, ut ipsi deponant vel contemnant, quos ipsi a manu Dei per impositionem manuum episcopalium docendi acceperant.

[2] By others called Eberhard

from a great danger, which gave him another opportunity of showing his unconquerable fortitude. It was an after-effect of that wild, lawless condition which had prevailed at Rome in the eleventh century (and to which an end was put by the popes who ruled in the spirit of Hildebrand), that Cintius, a Roman nobleman of licentious morals, one who indulged himself in the most extravagant actions and patronized the lowest crimes, was permitted to occupy a strong citadel built in the heart of the city, thus exercising a lordship of the very worst character. As Gregory would not tolerate such a person, and his firm will threatened to ruin this man's power, the latter determined to get rid of him by a conspiracy which he formed with Gregory's numerous enemies. The vigils in the night before Christmas, A. D. 1075, was the time selected for the deed. At the public service, Gregory was fallen upon and hurried away, wounded, to a tower in Cintius's castle. He remained calm and firm in the midst of all these insults and in the face of danger; not a word of complaint, or of supplication, fell from his lips. There was displayed on this occasion, too, a beautiful proof of the enthusiastic regard which Gregory had inspired towards himself in the more serious minds. A man and a woman, both of high rank, insisted on attending the pope in his confinement; the man endeavored to keep him warm with furs during the cold winter night; the woman bound up his wound. When, however, the next morning, Gregory's absence was observed, the most violent commotions broke out among the people. The citadel of Cintius was stormed; he saw himself compelled to give the pope his freedom, and it was by means of the latter alone, his life was saved from the fury of the people.

As Gregory was about to open the Lent-synod, in the year 1076, the above-mentioned Roland appeared, and, in the name of king Henry and the synod of Worms, announced the judgment which had there been passed. There arose a common feeling of bitter indignation, to which he would have fallen a victim, had not Gregory interposed and saved him.[1] The pope calmly heard all: without betraying the least agitation, he held a discourse, in which he distinctly set forth that men ought not to be surprised at these contests foretold by Christ; he declared himself resolved to suffer anything for the cause of God, and exhorted the cardinals to do the same. Then he pronounced, in the name of the apostle, the ban on king Henry: declared him (which was the natural consequence of this act, according to his theory of ecclesiastical law,) incompetent to reign any longer, and forbade his subjects to obey him for the future. He pronounced, also, sentence of excommunication on the bishops from whom everything had

[1] We doubtless have the words of an eye-witness in the chronicle of Bernold of Constance: Quid ibi tumultus et conclamationis et in legatos illos non ordinatae incursionis excreverit, *noverint illi*, qui praesto fuerunt. Hoc unum sit nostrum inde dixisse, dominum apostolicum non sine sui ipsius corporis magno satis periculo, *quamquam vix*, eos Romanorum manibus semivivos erripuisse. Monumenta res Allemannicas illustrantia ed S. Blas. a 1792. t. ii, p. 30. That violent enemy of the pope's, the princess Anna Comnena, unjustly accuses Gregory himself, of having treated the ambassadors in a shameful and abusive manner. In Alexias i, 13.

proceeded in that assembly at Worms. He announced the same punishment as awaiting the archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz, William of Utrecht, and Rupert of Bamberg, and the rest of the bishops who had taken part in that synod, unless they should come to Rome and justify their conduct.

This sentence pronounced by the pope was the signal for a violent and long-continued contest between the two parties, who fought each other both with the sword and with arguments. The men who were zealous for the cause of Henry, insisted on the sacredness of the oath, whose binding force no authority could destroy. They called it, therefore, an act of consummate wickedness, that a pope, setting himself above all laws human and divine, should have presumed to discharge subjects from their sworn obligations towards their princes. They also considered the power of princes as one founded in a divine order, and subsisting independently by itself; they appealed to the duties, inculcated in the New Testament, of obedience to those in authority, and would concede to no power on earth the right of annulling this obligation. They appealed to the fact, that the apostles had shown obedience even to pagan magistrates, and recommended such obedience; that the more ancient bishops and popes had never entertained a thought of deposing even idolatrous and heretical princes.[1] The fulmination of the papal ban, it was said, does not carry with it so much danger as it does fright. Human affairs would be in truly a sad condition, if the wrath of God followed every ebullition of human passion.[2] An unjust ban fell back upon the head of its author. The other party agreed, it is true, with all that was said with regard to the sanctity of an oath; but they maintained that an oath taken in reference to anything at variance with the divine law, could have no binding force. No oath given to the prince, therefore, could obligate subjects to obey him in setting himself up against the one to whom is committed, by God, the guidance of entire Christendom.[3] If he who

[1] So said the scholastic writer Guenrich, standing at this point of view, in the name of bishop Dieteric of Verdun, when these disputes had already lasted for some time. Martene et Durand thesaurus novus anecdotorum, t. i. Non est novum, homines seculares seculariter sapere et agere, novum est autem et omnibus retro seculis inauditum, pontifices regna gentium tam facile velle dividere. Nomen regum inter ipsa mundi initia repertum adeo postea stabilitum repentina factione elidere, Christos Dei, quoties libuerit plebejos sorte sicuti villicos mutare, regno patrum suorum decedere jussos, nisi confestim acquieverint, anathemati damnare. The author of this letter appeals to the precepts of the apostle Paul concerning duties to magistrates: Porro de ordinatis a Deo potestatibus omni studio suscipiendis, omni amore diligendis, omni honore reverendis, omni patientia tolerandis tanta ubique sapientia disputat. Concerning the indissoluble obligation of an oath, it is here said: Sanctam et omnibus retro seculis apud omnium gentium nationes inviolatam jurisjurandi religionem facillima, inquiunt, domini papae rescindit absolutio, et quod tantum est, ut illud omnis controversiae finem apostolus nominaret, Hebr. 6, 16, modo unius cartulae per quemlibet bajulatorem porrectae levissima infringere juberetur lectione.

[2] In the letter already cited: Hoc tonitruum non tantum portendit periculum, quantum intendit terroris. Male profecto rebus humanis consultum esset, si ad qualescunque animi concitati motus divina sequeretur damnatio, sicut illi uniuscujusque iracundia dictare vellet, qui omnia dispensat, in mensura, et pondere et numero.

[3] Thus archbishop Gebhard of Salzburg, in his letter written to bishop Hermann of Metz, in defence of the cause of Gregory the Seventh. It is here objected to the opposite party, that they brought forward such remarks as the following: ad percutiendam simpliciorum fratrum infirmam conscientiam, quatenus eis sub specie pietatis laqueum injiciant et quasi vera dicendo fallant, diligentius autem intuentibus ad nos-

has been expelled from the fellowship of the church became, by that very circumstance, incapable of administering any civil office, and if any man who continued to have fellowship with him, thereby procured his own expulsion from the church-community; if the pope, as the director of entire Christendom, might call to account all the rulers of the earth in case they abused their authority, might bring them to punishment, and depose them from office,[1] then it followed, as a matter of course, that to the king, on whom the pope had passed such a judgment, lawful obedience could no longer be rendered. The oath, moreover, by which the bishops bound themselves, before their consecration, to obey the pope, was contrary to the oath of homage given to the prince.[2] And when some appealed to the inviolable divine right of kings, the other party maintained on the other hand, that it was necessary to distinguish between the rightful authority of princes and the abuse of arbitrary will, between kings and tyrants. Princes deprived themselves of their own authority by abusing it.[3]

No impression could be made on pope Gregory by the doubts expressed respecting the lawfulness of his conduct by Hermann, bishop of Metz.[4] In the light of the principles which he maintained, it appeared to him a thing absolutely settled, that the pope might excommunicate a king, like any other mortal; and any doubt expressed on this point he could only look upon as a mark of incredible fatuity.[5] He appealed to the example of pope Zacharias, who pronounced sentence of deposition upon the last of the Merovingians, and absolved the Franks from their oath of allegiance to him; to the example of bishop Ambrose of Milan, who in fact excommunicated an emperor.[6] He asked whether Christ, when he committed to Peter the feeding of his sheep, the power to bind and to loose, made any exception in favor of princes.[7] If kings could not be excommunicated by the church, it would follow that neither could they receive absolution from the church. But to this, bishop Waltram of Naumburg, not without reason, replied, that Ambrose had, it is true, once excluded the emperor Theodosius from the communion of the church, which was attended with the most salutary consequences both to that emperor and to the common weal; but he had not the remotest intention or

trae controversiam causae nihil pertinere videntur. Nam quis sanae mentis perjurium grave peccatum esse dubitet? But from this, he says, it does not follow, ut quicquid quisque juret, indifferenter et sine retractatione servandum sit.

[1] Thus too writes Gerhoh of Reichersberg: Ordo clericalis cujus nimirum est officium, non solum plebejos, sed etiam reges increpare atque regibus aliis descendentibus, alios ordinare. L. c. in Ps. 29. f. 636.

[2] Credimus enim, memoriae illorum non excidisse, quod in sacro illo episcoporum et cleri conventu ad promerendam promotionem suam beato Petro suisque vicariis et successoribus fidem et subjectionem se servaturos promiserunt. Quomodo ergo hoc pluris faciunt, quod in cubiculo sive in aula regis inter Palatinos strepitus conspiraverunt, quam illud, quod coram sacro altari sanctisque sanctorum reliquiis sub testimonio Christi et ecclesiae professi sunt?

[3] So says Bernold of Constance, l. c. p. 57: Recte faciendo nomen regis tenetur, alioquin amittitur, unde est hoc vetus elogium: rex eris, si recte facis, si non facis, non eris.

[4] See Gregory's letters, l. iv, ep. 2.

[5] Licet pro magna fatuitate nec etiam iis respondere debeamus.

[6] See vol. iii, p. 68.

[7] See v. ii, p. 180.

wish to disturb thereby the relation subsisting between the emperor and his subjects. He had rendered to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. Even towards Valentinian the Second and his mother Justina, Ambrose had never, in all the disputes with them, taken any such liberties.[1] His reasoning is not so strong with regard to the other example, of pope Zacharias. He says, the pope did not by any means depose Childeric, nor absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance to him; for Childeric merely bore the *name* of king, without possessing the kingly power. Of the latter, therefore, he did not need to be deprived.[2]

Yet the ban pronounced by the pope produced a great effect in Germany, which was increased by the prevailing dissatisfaction with Henry's government. The bishop Udo of Triers, after his return from Rome, avoided all intercourse with the spiritual and secular counsellors of the emperor, who had been excommunicated by the pope. He declared that, by holding fellowship with the excommunicated king, one became involved in the same condition; that only at his special request, permission had been granted him by the pope, of conversing with the king; yet even to him the communion of prayer and of the Lord's table, with that monarch, had been forbidden. By the example and the representations of Udo, many were induced to draw away from the king. But the men of the other party sought, by the arguments above mentioned, to confirm the king in his resistance to the pope; they maintained that an arbitrary, unjust ban, ought not to be feared; that, in such a case, religion was only employed as a pretext to cover private passions, and private ends. They called upon him to use the sword, which God had intrusted to him as the legitimate sovereign for the punishment of evil doers, against the enemies of the empire. Such language found a ready ear on the part of the king. He was inclined already to bid defiance to the papal ban, and to threaten with his kingly authority those who sided with the pope's party. But as the number of those who went over to that party was constantly increasing, and he wanted power to carry his threats into execution, he suddenly adopted quite another tone. He sought to bend the minds of his opponents by negotiations; but this also proved fruitless; and they were already on the point of proceeding to the extremest measures.

In the year 1076, the Suabian and Saxon princes assembled at Tribur. Before this assembly appeared, as papal legates, the patriarch Sighard of Aquileia, and the bishop Altmann of Passau, a man eminently distinguished for his strict piety. And here we may notice how

[1] See Waltram Naumburgens. de unitate eccles. et imperii, l. i, p. 66. Sed ipse quoque sanctus Ambrosius ecclesiam non divisit, sed ea, quae Caesaris sunt, Caesari et quae Dei, Deo reddenda esse docuit, qui Theodosium ecclesiastica coercuit disciplina, etc. Ecce illa excommunicatio quam utilis erat ecclesiae pariter atque ipsi imperatori Theodosio, quae nunc prodendi schismatis ponitur exemplo, quo separentur principes, vel milites reipublicae ab imperatoris sui consortio simul et obsequio!

[2] Lib. i, p. 17. Quandoquidem ille Hilderichus nihil omnino regiae potestatis vel dignitatis habuisse describatur, atque ideo comprobatur, quod non fuerit dominus aliquorum sive rector, quoniam rex *a* regendo dicitur.

large a party stood up for the pope from among those who felt a serious regard for religion. Several laymen, who had renounced important stations and great wealth for the purpose of devoting themselves to a strictly ascetic life, now appeared publicly as advocates of the papal principles. These refused to hold communion with any one who maintained familiar intercourse with king Henry after his excommunication, till each had personally obtained absolution from bishop Altmann, the prelate empowered by the pope to bestow it. After a deliberation of seven days, it was resolved to proceed to the election of a new king. Henry, after a variety of fruitless negotiations with the opposite party, among whom partly the political, partly the religious interest predominated, determined to give way. An agreement was entered into, to the effect that the pope should be invited to visit Augsburg on the festival of the purification of Mary; there, in a numerous assembly of the princes, all accusations against the king should be presented, and then, after the pope had heard what both parties had to say, the decision should be left with him. If the king, by any fault of his own, remained excommunicated a year, he should be considered forever incapable of holding the government. In the mean time, he should abstain from all intercourse with the excommunicated, and live in Speier, as a private man. Henry the Fourth agreed to all the conditions proposed to him, severe as they were; and as everything was now depending on his being absolved from the papal ban, in order that he might be able to negotiate on equal footing with the princes, so he determined to pay a visit to the pope himself in Italy, before the latter could come to Germany. He was willing to risk everything to obtain absolution.

A few days previous to Christmas, in the unusually cold winter of 1076–77, he crossed the Alps with his wife and little son, attended only by one individual, of no rank. Meantime, the ambassadors of the German princes had come to the pope, and, in compliance with their invitation, the latter set out on his journey, expecting to reach Augsburg at the appointed time, on the 2d of February, 1077;[1] although his friends advised him not to undertake this journey, probably because they feared the power of Gregory's enemies in Italy. It had been agreed upon, that, at a particular point of time, delegates from the princes should meet him on the borders of Italy for the purpose of escorting him to Augsburg. Twenty days before the time appointed, the pope set out on his journey. Meanwhile came also the messengers of king Henry, through whom the latter promised him every satisfaction and amendment, and urgently begged for absolution. Gregory, however, would not meddle with the matter; he only loaded him with severe reproaches for his transgressions.[2]

[1] It is evident from the words of Gregory himself in his letter to the Germans, Mansi xx, f. 386, that this was the reason of his undertaking the journey to Lombardy. The account given by Domnizo in his life of Mathilda, at the beginning of the second book, is false therefore; namely, that Gregory came to Lombardy at the request of the latter, who stood forth as mediator between the king and the pope.

[2] Gregory himself says: Acriter eum de suis excessibus per omnes, qui inter currebant, nunctos redarguimus.

If, viewing the matter in the light of the pope's rigidly consistent system, we might perhaps approve of Gregory's conduct towards the *insolent* Henry, yet we cannot fail to miss in his conduct towards the *humbled* man, that spirit of love which proceeds from a pure gospel; we perceive in it nothing but the stiff firmness of a self-will, which, spurning all human feelings, goes straight onward to the mark on which it has once fixed.

The promised escort from Germany found it impossible, on account of the many difficulties they met with, to make their appearance at the time appointed; and Gregory's journey to Germany was hindered by various circumstances. Meanwhile Henry arrived in Italy, and the reception he there met with, stood in melancholy contrast with his actual situation. A large party exulted at his appearance: the numerous opponents of Gregory, among the bishops and nobles, hoped to gain in the king a head to their party; and they were ready to do anything in his service. Gregory, being fully aware of the fickle-mindedness of the young king, felt uncertain whether such a reception would not produce a change in his disposition, and his mode of procedure. In this uncertainty with regard to his own situation, he betook himself for a while to the castle of his enthusiastically devoted friend, the powerful Margravine Mathilda of Tuscany.[1]

But Henry, for the present, had no other object in view than to get himself absolved from the ban. Before him, went the excommunicated bishops and nobles of Germany, in the habit of penitents, barefoot and in woollen garments, to beg absolution from the pope. The latter listened,

[1] The connection of the pope with this lady was certainly of the purest character; and so it appears in his correspondence with her. The enthusiastic devotedness of the most strict and pious persons of the age testifies in favor of Gregory. The accusations of his most violent enemies, who brought so many absurd charges against him, certainly cannot be regarded as trustworthy evidence. It was natural, that they should avail themselves of this connection of Gregory, for the purpose of throwing suspicion on the character of this severe censor of the morals of the clergy with regard to this very point, and thereby to place his zeal for the laws of the celibacy of priests in an unfavorable point of light. That fierce opponent of the Hildebrandian party, bishop Waltram of Naumburg, intimates this suspicion against the pope, however, in such a way, that it is easy to see how little reason he himself had for regarding it as well-grounded. Apolog. l. ii, c. 36. Mathilda illa post octavum quoque annum, quo defunctus est Hildebrand familiaris ejus, defendit promptissime contra sedem apostolicam (Guibert's party) et contra imperatorem partem ipsius, qui propter frequens cum ea et familiare colloquium generavit plurimis scaevae suspicionis scandalum. Henry, bishop of Speier, expresses himself in stronger terms in his invective against Gregory, Eccard. t. ii, in the collection of letters of the Cod. Bamberg. ep. 162: Qui etiam quasi foetore quodam gravissimi scandali totam ecclesiam replesti de convictu et cohabitatione alienae mulieris familiariori, quam necesse sit. In qua re verecundia nostra magis quam causa laborat, quum haec generalis querela unicuique personuerit, omnia judicia, omnia decreta per feminas in sede apostolica actitari, denique per feminas totum orbem ecclesiae administrari. The impartial Lambert of Aschaffenburg remarks concerning the relation of Mathilda to the pope: Tanquam patri vel domino sedulum exhibebat officium. He then refers to the misinterpretations put on this relation, which proceeded from the friends of Henry, and particularly from the opponents of the laws of celibacy among the clergy, and says of these: Sed apud omnes sanum aliquid sapientes luce clarius constabat, falsa esse, quae dicebantur. Nam et papa tam eximie tamque apostolice vitam instituebat, ut nec minimam sinistri rumoris maculam conversationis ejus sublimitas admitteret et illa in urbe celeberrima atque in tanta obsequentium frequentia, obscoenum aliquid perpetrans latere nequaquam potuisset.

it is true, to their petition; but he required of them such proofs of their repentance, as would be calculated to leave a right lasting impression on men so inured to luxury. Each of the bishops was obliged to remain from morn to evening shut up in a solitary cell, in his penitential raiment, partaking only of the most meagre diet. Then he allowed them to come before him and gave them absolution, after mildly reproving them for their transgressions, and exhorting them to guard against such conduct for the future. When they took their leave of him, he strictly charged them to abstain from all fellowship with king Henry, till he had become reconciled with the church; only for the purpose of exhorting him to repentance, they might be allowed to converse with him.

But Gregory proceeded more harshly with the young king himself. First, he repelled the urgent entreaties of that prince, and the intercessions of Mathildis, of the abbot Hugo of Cluny who was the king's god-father, and of many others, who implored his compassion on the young monarch. He says himself, in his letter to the Germans: "All were surprised at his unusual severity, and many imagined they perceived in it a tyrannical cruelty."[1] He persisted in requiring that everything should be referred over to the trial which was to be instituted at the appointed convention in Germany. At length, he yielded to the entreaties and intercessions poured in upon him, but required of king Henry still severer proofs of his repentance than he had demanded from those bishops. The king, after having laid aside all the insignia of his imperial rank, and clothed himself in the garb of a penitent, was admitted into the second inclosure of the castle of Canossa, where he waited fasting, during three days, in the rough winter at the commencement of the year 1077, till at length, on the fourth day, the pope admitted him to his presence. He gave him absolution under the condition, that he should appear before the proposed general assembly in Germany, where the pope would listen to the accusations of his adversaries, and to what he had to say in defence of himself, and give his decision accordingly. Till then, he should utterly renounce the government, and, if he obtained it again, bind himself to support the pope in everything requisite for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical laws. If he failed to observe this condition, he should again fall under the ban.[2] And the abbot Hugo of Cluny, and several persons present, of the spiritual and secular orders, pledged themselves that the king would fulfil the conditions of the compact. The pope then celebrated the mass in the presence of the king and of a numerous multitude. When he had consecrated the host, he observed, while taking a portion of it, that he had been

[1] Ut pro eo multis precibus et lacrimis intercedentibus, omnes quidem insolitam mentis nostrae duritiam mirarentur, nonnulli vero in nobis non apostolicae severitatis gravitatem, sed quasi tyrannicae feritatis crudelitatem esse clamarent.

[2] In his letter to the Germans, Gregory appeals also to the fact that everything was still undecided; that he was bound by no obligation to the king; adhuc totius negotii causa suspensa est. Sciatis nos non aliter regi obligatos esse, nisi quod puro sermone sicut nobis mos est ea diximus, quibus eum ad salutem et honorem suum aut cum justitia aut cum misericordia sine nostrae aut illius animae periculo adjuvare possimus

accused by his enemies in Germany of many offences. True, he could bring forward many witnesses of his innocence. But he chose rather to appeal to the testimony of God than to that of man ; and for the purpose of refuting, in the shortest way, all those charges, he here called on God himself to witness his innocence, while he now took, in averring it, the body of the Lord. Let Almighty God now declare him free, if he was innocent, or cause the partaking of the body of Christ to prove his immediate destruction, if he was guilty. Gregory regarded this, like his contemporaries, as a judgment of God; and such an appeal to the divine decision by a miracle was in perfect harmony with his whole mode of thinking. With the greatest composure he partook of the holy supper, which to him — since, according to his own religious conviction, this was really subjecting himself to a judgment of God — would have been impossible, if in his conscience he had felt that he was guilty. In very deed, therefore, it was the testimony of a tranquil conscience, and on the assembled multitude (to whom this appeared as such a triumph of innocence as if the voice of God had spoken directly from heaven) it must have made a most powerful impression. With a loud shout of approbation it was accepted by the whole assembly; and praise to the God who had so glorified innocence, rung out from every mouth. When the shouts of the multitude had somewhat abated, the pope turned with the remainder of the host to the young king, and invited him to attest his innocence of all the charges brought against him from Germany, by doing the same. Then there would be no occasion for the trial which it had been proposed to hold in Germany; for all human judicatories were liable to error; and then he himself would, from that moment, stand forth as Henry's defender. But Henry was neither sufficiently sure of his own innocence nor sufficiently hardened against religious impressions, to subject himself, uncertain of the result, to such an ordeal. He turned pale at the proposal, whispered with his attendants, sought evasions, and finally requested the pope to leave everything to be decided by the trial to be had in Germany. He pledged himself, by oath, to refer the settlement of the disputes in Germany to the pope's decision, and to insure his safety, so far as it depended on himself, in his journey to Germany. At the close of the service, Gregory invited him to a repast, conversed with him in a friendly manner, and then dismissed him with serious admonitions.

The question here arises, whether the pope was perfectly sincere in effecting this reconciliation with king Henry ? The enemies of Gregory charge him[1] with having persecuted him from the beginning, on a calculated plan of bringing about his utter ruin, and of using everything as a means to accomplish this end. If Henry obeyed, and refrained entirely from exercising his kingly authority till that assembly could meet in Germany, then he would, by that very act, render himself contemptible ; while the power of the anti-emperor, about whose election men were already busying themselves, would become

[1] So bishop Waltram of Naumburg, in his Work De unitate ecclesiae et imperii l. i. c. vi.

more and more confirmed. Or if he did not fulfil the condition, an opportunity would be given the pope to accuse him of violating the agreement, and again to pronounce the ban upon him. In what light would Gregory, with this fine-spun plan of revenge, requiring him to turn the most sacred acts into a means of deception, have to be regarded? If after having granted king Henry absolution, he had still been able to say to the enemies of that monarch, who were dissatisfied with this step, as he is represented to have said in a letter, that "they should give themselves no trouble about what he had done; he was only going to send them back Henry, loaded with deeper guilt,"[1] what diabolical malice and hypocrisy! Well might Waltram of Naumburg say, "he dismissed him in peace; but peace such as Judas pretended, not such as Christ bestowed."[2] With perfect justice might he exclaim, in view of such an act of duplicity: "This is not acting like a successor of Peter; this is not feeding Christ's sheep, to send one away loaded with still heavier guilt, and one too who repented of his fault. This was not acting like a priest of our Lord, who himself says in the gospel, that in heaven there is more joy over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just men that need no repentance."[3]

But we are listening to the words of a passionate antagonist. The language of party-passion, on either side, is to be heard with distrust. Who could penetrate into Gregory's heart, so as to be sure of the disposition in which he acted? The reasoning from an actual result to a deliberate purpose is always most unsafe. Even though Gregory had said what is laid to his charge, or something like it, still, a great deal depends on the question, in what connection he said it, and whether with some condition or in an unconditioned manner. The dignity and self-respect which Gregory ever exhibits in his public communications, render it extremely unlikely, that he would suffer himself to be hurried by passion to utter words so much in contradiction with those qualities. In granting king Henry absolution, Gregory assuredly said nothing to him which could have been designed to deceive him. He gave him plainly enough to understand, that all was depending on his future behavior. He even persisted in declaring that the whole matter was reserved for the trial which was to take place under his presidency in Germany; earlier than this, nothing was to be determined in relation to the settlement of the government.[4] By *his own* judicial decision, everything should be set to rights in Germany; and only in case he submitted wholly to this,

[1] Ne sitis solliciti, quoniam culpabiliorem eum reddo vobis.

[2] Concerning Henry: Dimissus est in pace, qualem scilicet pacem Judas simulavit; non qualem Christus reliquit.

[3] His words: Certe culpabiliorem facere aliquem, praecipue autem regem, quem praecipit Petrus apostolus honorificare, hoc non est oves Christi pascere. Culpabiliorem, inquam, facere, praecipue eum, quem poeniteat culpabilem existere, hoc non est, sacerdotem Domini esse, cum ipse in evangelio Dominus dicat, gaudium fieri in coelo super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente, quam super nonaginta novem justis, qui non indigent poenitentia.

[4] As he says in his letter, in which he reported to the Germans his transactions with Henry, ep. iv, 12. Ita adhuc totius negotii causa suspensa est, ut et adventus noster et consiliorum vestrorum unanimitas permaxime necessaria esse videantur. Comp. the remarks already quoted, p. 114, in the note.

could Henry calculate on a lasting peace with the pope. As to the fact, therefore, the remarks of Waltram with regard to the precarious position of the emperor, however he might act, were correct; though it cannot be said of the pope that, from the first, he only became reconciled to Henry in appearance, and had nothing else in view than his utter destruction. He acted thus, impelled by that reckless and persevering resolution with which he followed out false principles. He sacrificed to his consistency the true interests of the misled king and the well-being of the German people. It must be owned, however, that it was Henry who, hurried on by the force of circumstances, *first* broke the terms of the treaty.

When he returned back to his friends, and with them repaired to the states of Lombardy, he found the tone of feeling there very much altered. Men were highly indignant at the manner in which he had been made to humble himself before the detested Gregory. They were upon the point of renouncing him; they were for nominating his son emperor, and with the latter marching straight to Rome. As then Henry had so many enemies in Germany, as he could not place any great reliance on the pope, and as he here found a considerable party, who were willing to do anything for him if he would place himself in their hands, he now went over wholly to this side. He allied himself once more with Gregory's enemies, acted once more as monarch, and resumed once more the counsellors whom the pope had excommunicated. As the earlier-appointed assembly in Germany could not be holden, the states dissatisfied with king Henry appointed another assembly, to meet in the beginning of March 1077, and invited the pope to be present for the purpose of restoring order and tranquillity to Germany. But this also was prevented by Gregory's detention in Italy. Gregory sent to Germany two legates, who reported to the assembly what causes had hindered him from coming to Germany, and left it to them to provide, as they deemed best, for the necessities of the empire. At this assembly, Rudolph duke of Suabia was elected king in Henry's place. Although the pope was doubtless already resolved to renew the ban against Henry, if the latter did not alter his conduct, yet he still passed no definitive sentence. He declared himself, at first, neutral between the two parties, and named both the princes kings in his letters, and reserved it to himself, when he should visit Germany, to decide which party had the right. Meanwhile, in Germany, much blood was shed on both sides. The two parties persecuted each other with unrelenting ferocity. State and church were rent in pieces by these quarrels, while Gregory quietly looked on, and by his ambiguous declarations and acts kept up the contest. He expressed his pain[1] at seeing so many thousand Christians fall victims to temporal and eternal death through the pride of one man; at seeing the Christian religion and the Roman church thereby prostrated to the ground. He did not declare, however, whom he meant by this individual. He only called upon the Germans to renounce obedience

[1] Ep. 149, in Cod. Babenberg. Eccard. t. ii, f. 151.

to the proud man, who hindered him from coming to Germany; on the other hand to obey him who showed himself devoted to the apostolical see. The partisans of Rudolph fiercely reproached him with hindering, by this ambiguous conduct, the decision of a quarrel, into which they at least had suffered themselves to be drawn in obedience to the papal see, when on the other hand, by a distinct declaration, he could bring the matter to an end. But Gregory was not moved by this language to depart from his plan. He exhorted the Germans to fidelity, and testified his firmness by declaring himself resolved to abide unswervingly by the principles on which he had always acted, without regarding the voice of the multitude, by which king Henry was defended and he himself accused of harshness towards that prince.[1] When, however, in the year 1080, the weapons of Rudolph met with continual success, the pope finally, at a Roman synod, passed the definitive sentence. He pronounced anew the ban on king Henry, because by his means the assembly in Germany had been prevented from meeting, and he recognized Rudolph as emperor, sending him a crown, inscribed with a motto in correspondence with the principles of his consistent theocratical system, claiming to himself, as Peter's successor, full power and authority to decide the contest concerning the election of an emperor in Germany.[2] But at the same time he gave him also to understand, that he should not yield an iota of the law against investiture.

It was now, however, for the first time, that Gregory's firmness was really to be put to the test; for as, in this same year, duke Rudolph lost his life in a battle on the Elster, although again victorious, so Henry saw himself no longer prevented from directing his course again to Italy. After sentence of deposition had already been passed, at a previous council of Mentz, by a small number of bishops of Henry's party, on Gregory the Seventh, the same thing was repeated by a more numerous assembly, held at Brixen, of those dissatisfied with the Hildebrandian principles of government from Italy and Germany. Characteristic of the spirit of this assembly, are some of the charges brought against Gregory; that he boasted of being favored with divine revelations, of possessing the gift of prophecy, that he was given to the interpretation of dreams, that he was a disciple of Berengar.[3] One of Gregory's opponents, Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, was chosen pope, under the name of Clement the Third. But this arbitrary proceeding appeared too much like a political movement to have the least influence on men's religious convictions. The free-minded

[1] Mansi Consil. vii. 3. Quotquot Latini sunt, omnes causam Henrici praeter admodum paucos laudant ac defendunt et perinimiae duritiae ac impietatis circa eum me redarguunt.

[2] Inscription: "Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolpho." Plank, in his history of the papacy (ii, 1, p. 198) says, certainly with injustice: "The pope, in this inscription, probably did not have half so much in his thoughts, as was attributed to him in the issue." What we have said above concerning the principles of this pope, as they are made known to us in his letters, as well as what we know concerning the system of the entire party, proves, beyond question, that Gregory had actually in his mind all that these words literally contain.

[3] Catholicam atque apostolicam fidem de corpore et sanguine in quaestionem ponentem, haeretici Berengarii antiquum discipulum, divinationum et somniorum cultorem

bishop Dieteric of Verdun, rendered famous by his fidelity to king Henry, had been induced to take a part in these proceedings of the above-mentioned assembly at Mentz; but he soon repented of it, his conscience reproaching him for this step. He suddenly and in a secret manner forsook the assembly, and felt impelled to seek absolution from Gregory the Seventh, whom he recognized as the lawful pope.[1]

King Henry himself felt a want of confidence in his cause. He gladly offered his hand for peace, and declared himself ready, before penetrating farther with his army into Italy, to enter into negotiations for that purpose with the pope. But the latter showed no disposition to yield anything, though his friends represented to him, that all would go over to the side of the king in Italy, and that no help was to be expected from Germany. He replied that for himself it was not so very great a thing to be left destitute of all help from men.[2] He exhorted the Germans, not to be in haste about the election of a new emperor after the death of Rudolph. He prescribed to the new king, without taking any notice of his own perilous situation, in an imperative tone, a form of oath drawn up in accordance with his theocratic system, whereby the king was to promise that he would faithfully observe, as became a genuine Christian, all that the pope should command in the name of true obedience,[3] and consecrate himself, as soon as he should have an opportunity of meeting him in person, a *miles sancti Petri et illius*.

It is deserving of notice that the pope, who had shown so much strictness in his judicial sentences against married priests, now yielded on this point, for the moment, to the force of circumstances; that because Henry's party gained an advantage from the prevailing dissatisfaction with the laws respecting celibacy, and because the deficiency of ecclesiastics who would have been competent, according to the rigid construction of those earlier laws respecting celibacy, to administer the sacraments, was too great, he deemed it best to recommend to his legates the exercise of indulgence in this matter till more quiet times.[4]

The same inflexibility which Gregory opposed to king Henry, when that monarch was pressing towards Rome, he still maintained, when besieged during two years in Rome itself. No force could move him to enter into negotiations with the king, with whom, if he had been willing to crown him emperor, he might have concluded an advan-

[1] He writes about his participation in the above-mentioned convention: Multipliciter coactus sum ibi agere contra ordinem, contra salutem meam, imo contra dignitatem ecclesiasticam, abrenuntiavi sedenti in sede apostolica, et hoc sine ratione aliqua, cum praesens non audiretur, auditus discuteretur, discussus convinceretur. Abrenuntiavi illi, cui in examine meae ordinationis professus fueram obedientiam, cui subjectionem pollicitus eram, cui post b. Petrum suscepto regimine mihi commissae ecclesiae commissus fueram.

[2] Quod (auxilium) si nobis, qui illius superbiam parvi pendimus, deficiat, non adeo grave videtur. Mansi Concil. ix, 3.

[3] Quodcunque mihi ipse papa praeceperit, sub his videlicet verbis, per veram obedientiam, fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo.

[4] Lib. ix. ep. 3. Quod vero de sacerdotibus interrogastis, placet nobis, ut in praesentiarum tum propter populorum turbationes, tum etiam propter bonorum inopiam, scilicet quia paucissimi sunt, qui fidelibus officia religionis persolvant, pro tempore rigorem canonicum temperando debeatis sufferre.

tageous peace. He despised the threats of the Romans. He chose rather, as he declared, to die as a martyr, than to swerve in the least from the strict line of justice.[1]

At length, in the year 1084, the Romans, tired of the siege, and discontented with the defiance of the pope, opened their gates to king Henry and received him with demonstrations of joy, which he announced to his friends in Germany as a triumph bestowed by God himself.[2] Gregory was obliged to retreat into the castle of St. Angelo(domum Crescentii). The emperor gave orders for convoking a numerous public assembly, in which the sentence of deposition on Gregory and the election of Clement were confirmed.[3] At the Easter festival, the new pope, Clement, consecrated Henry emperor, and the latter soon departed from Rome. By the Norman duke, Robert Guiscard, Gregory was at length liberated from his confinement, and repaired to Cremona, where he soon after died, on the 25th of May, 1085. His last words are supposed to furnish evidence of his own conviction of the goodness of his cause; they were as follows: "I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."[4] These words harmonize at least with the conviction which Gregory, in his letters, to the last moment of his life, expresses in the strongest language; and it will be much sooner believed that he sealed the consistency of his life with *such* words than that he testified on his deathbed, as another account reports,[5] his repentance at the controversy which he had excited, and recalled the sentence he had pronounced on his adversaries. At all events, we recognize in these two opposite accounts the mode of thinking which prevailed in the two hostile parties.

Under the name of this pope, we have a number of brief maxims relating to the laws and government of the church, called his dictates (dictatus). Although these maxims did not by any means proceed from himself, still, they contain the principles which he sought to realize in his government of the church, the principles of papal absolutism,—signalizing that new epoch in the history of the papacy which is to be attributed to him as the author, whereby everything was made to depend on the decision of the pope, and the jurisdiction over emperors and kings, as over all the presiding officers of the church, was placed in his hands. Most of these maxims may be confirmed by passages from his letters.

[1] Lib. ix. ep. 11.

[2] Thus the emperor writes from Rome to Dieteric, bishop of Verdun: Incredibile videtur, quod verissimum probatur, quod factum est in Roma, ut ita dicam, cum decem hominibus in nobis operatus est Dominus, quod antecessores nostri si fecissent cum decem millibus, miraculum esset omnibus.

[3] The emperor writes, in the above-cited letter, after his departure from Rome: (Romani) summo triumpho et fide prosequuti sunt nos, in tantum ut in Domino fiducialiter dicamus, quia tota Roma in manu nostra est, excepto illo castello, in quo conclusus est Hildebrand, scilicet in domo Crescentii. Quem Hildebrandum legali omnium cardinalium (which certainly is exaggerated) ac totius populi Romani judicio scias abjectum et electum papam nostrum Clementem in sede apostolica sublimatum omnium Romanorum acclamatione, nosque a papa Clemente ordinatum et consensu omnium Romanorum consecratum in die s. Paschae in imperatorem totius populi Romani. Gesta Trevirorum ed. Wyttenbach et Mueller. Vol. i, p. 164, 1836.

[4] Dilexi justitiam et odi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio.

[5] By Sigebert of Gemblours ad h. a.

A contest like that between the emperor Henry and Gregory the Seventh, could not be brought to a termination by the death of the latter; for although the quarrel had at length become a personal one, still there ever lay at bottom withal, a conflict of opposite party tendencies and interests. Gregory was the hero and the saint of the party zealous for the system of the church theocracy. His death in misfortune appeared to that party a martyrdom for the holy cause.[1] He had, moreover, for his successors, men whom he himself would have selected as like-minded with himself, and as persons of ability. After the first of these, Victor the Third (Gregory's enthusiastic admirer the abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino), had died, A. D. 1087, Otto, bishop of Ostia, was chosen pope under the name of Urban the Second.

Though Urban was obliged to yield to the imperial party, which made their own pope, Clement, sovereign in Rome; still, events by which public opinion was gradually gained over to his side, were in his favor, so that, even when banished from the seat of the papacy, he was still enabled to exercise the most powerful influence. He could resume the position of a judge over princes; and the cause in which he did so, was one where the pope could not fail to appear as the upholder of the authority of the divine law, and of the sacredness of the marriage covenant; and the light in which he here exhibited himself, was necessarily reflected, greatly to his own advantage, on the whole relation in which he stood to his age. Philip, king of France, a prince accustomed to give free indulgence to his passions, in the year 1092, repudiated his lawful wife, Bertha, with the intention of marrying another, Berthrade, who had left her lawful husband, the count of Anjou. He found bishops cowardly and mean enough to serve as the instruments of his will. But the truly pious bishop Yves of Chartres, a prelate distinguished for the conscientious administration of his pastoral office, accustomed boldly to speak the truth to princes and popes, and zealous in contending for the purity of morals as well as the sacred tenure of the marriage covenant,[2] was of another mind. When invited to attend the king's wedding, he declared he could not consent to do so, until, by a general assembly of the French church, the lawfulness of his separation from his first wife, and of the new marriage, had undergone a fair investigation. "Whereas, I am formally summoned to Paris with your wife, concerning whom I know not whether she may be your wife,"[3] he wrote to the king, "therefore be assured, that for conscience' sake, which I must preserve pure in the sight of God, and for the sake of my good name, which the priest of Christ is bound to preserve towards those who are without, I would rather be sunk with a millstone in the depths of the sea, than to be the means of giving offence to the souls of the weak. Nor does this stand in the least contradiction with the fidelity which I have vowed to you; but I believe I shall best maintain that fidelity by speaking to you as I do; since I am

[1] Thus the abbot and cardinal Gottfried of Vendôme, in speaking of the opposition to lay investiture, says of Gregory the Seventh: Qui pro defensione hujus fidei mortuus est in exilio. Ep. 7.

[2] See e. g. his letters, ed. Paris, 1610, ep. 5

[3] Ep. 15.

convinced that for you to do as you propose, will bring great injury upon your soul, and great peril to your crown." Neither by threats and violence, nor by promises, could the pious man be turned in the least from the course which he considered right. He vehemently reproached those bishops who neglected their duty. The king's anger against him had for its consequence, that, by one of the nobles, his property was confiscated, and he himself put under confinement. The first men of the city of Chartres now combined to procure the release of their bishop by force; but he remonstrated in the strongest language against such a proceeding.[1] "By laying houses in ashes, and plundering the poor," he wrote to them, "ye cannot propitiate God's favor, but will only provoke his vengeance; and without his favor neither can ye nor any man deliver me. I would not, therefore, that on my account ye should make the cry of the poor and the complaint of widows go up to God's ear. For neither is it befitting that I, who did not attain to the bishopric by warlike weapons, should recover it again by such means, which would not be the act of a shepherd, but of a robber. If the arm of the Lord has stricken me, and is still stretched out over me, then let me alone to bear my sorrow and the anger of the Lord, till he vindicates my cause; and wish not to augment my misery by making others wretched. For I am determined not only to suffer incarceration or the deprivation of my ecclesiastical rank, but even to die, rather than that on my account one drop of blood should be spilt." He called upon laity and clergy, instead of attempting to effect his liberation by such means, simply to pray for him; for prayer had procured the deliverance of Peter, Acts 12. The king caused bishop Yves to be informed that he would forbear doing him a great harm, and on the other hand bestow on him great favors, if, by his intercession, he would obtain leave for him to retain Berthrade a short time longer; but Yves repelled the proposition with horror, saying, that neither bribes nor deception could blot out any man's sin, while he resolved to persist in it.[2] He who resolved to persist in sin, could not redeem himself from its guilt by alms or gifts.[3] There was no help for the king, except by abstaining from his sin, and submitting himself by repentance to the yoke of Christ; for God did not require men's possessions but themselves as an offering in order to their salvation.[4] While Yves rejected all forcible, he employed every lawful means which the existing constitution of the church put into his hands, to procure victory to the side of the righteous cause. He applied to pope Urban the Second, and was strongly supported by him. This pontiff addressed a severe letter of reproof to the French bishops who had suffered themselves to be used as mere instruments of the king's pleasure, and threatened the king with the ban, if he did not separate from Berthrade. He demanded, under the same

[1] Ep. 20.

[2] Ep. 47.

[3] He writes to the Marshal of the royal court (Dapifer): Ex auctoritate divina hoc caritati tuae rescribo, quia nulla redemptione vel commutatione quis peccatum suum poterit abolere, quamdiu vult in eo permanere. Nemo in peccato suo perdurare volens peccatum suum poterit aliqua eleemosyna vel oblatione redimere.

[4] Cum Deus non nostra, sed nos ad salutem nostram requirat.

threat, the liberation of Yves. This demand was complied with; but the might of papal authority still could not do the work thoroughly. A council, which assembled at Rheims in 1094, once more allowed itself to be determined by its dependence on the king, and cited bishop Yves, who was animated by a different spirit, before its tribunal, to answer to the charge of high-treason and of violating his oath of allegiance to the king. Yves protested against the competency of this tribunal, and appealed to the pope; and in a letter relating to this matter,[1] he said, "The charge of high-treason fell with more justice upon those who by their treacherous compliance had done the king most harm, who had shrunk from applying sharper remedies for healing the wound, when milder ones were unavailing."[2] "If you had, with me, held fast to this principle," he writes to them, "you would have already restored our patient to health. Consider whether, so long as you neglect to do this, you evince that perfect fidelity to the king which you are bound to show; whether you rightly discharge the duty of your calling. Let the king, then," concluded this pious man, in a truly apostolical spirit, "do towards me what, under God's permission, he may please and be able to do. Let him shut me up, or shut me out, and deprive me of the protection of the law. By the inspiration and under the guidance of the grace of God, have I resolved to suffer for the law of my God; and no consideration shall induce me to participate in the guilt of those, in whose punishment I would not share also." In the very same year the pope's threat was executed on the king. At a council in Autun, A. D. 1094, the archbishop Hugo of Lyons, as papal legate, actually pronounced the ban on the king, and not till the latter submitted and made professions of amendment[3] did the pope remove the ban, which, however, on finding that he had been deceived, he pronounced anew, at the council of Clermont.

Meantime, there had been developing itself, among the Western nations, a great movement, which beyond every other could not fail so to operate as to increase the authority of the pope and exalt his dignity; for he was called to place himself at the head of a vast undertaking which grew out of and was consecrated to the religious interest, which was seized with mighty enthusiasm by the nations, and for which vast forces were leagued together. This was an event upon which Urban could not have made any previous calculation, — a long-prepared event, and hastened to its crisis by a circumstance in itself insignificant. Already had Silvester the Second,[4] and Gregory

[1] Ep. 35.

[2] Quod, ut pace vestra dicam, rectius in eos retorqueri potest, qui vulnus fomentis incurabile, tanquam pii medici cauteriis competentibus dissimulant urere vel medicinali ferro praecidere.

[3] Yves warned the pope (ep. 46) not to let himself be deceived by the envoys of the king, and induced to grant him absolution. It was intended to alarm the pope by the threat, that the king, if he were not pronounced free from the ban, would go over to the pope of the imperial party. Yves wrote him: What hope of sinning with impunity will be given hereafter to transgressors, if forgiveness is granted to the impenitent, is a point on which I need not detain your wisdom, since it is especially your business not to protect sinners but to punish them.

[4] See vol. iii, p. 375.

the Seventh[1] broached the idea of an expedition of Western Christendom for the liberation of their fellow-believers in the East, and for the recovery of the holy places: but the minds of men were not as yet quite ripe for such a thought. There was need, in the first place, of a gradual preparation. Pope Victor the Third issued, in the year 1086, an invitation for a crusade to be undertaken under the banner of St. Peter, against the Saracens in North Africa, and promised to all who should take part in it a plenary indulgence. After this, came pilgrims from the East, with most distressing accounts of the insults and ill-treatment which Christians had to suffer from the rude Mohammedans, and of the manifold profanations of the holy places. Among these pilgrims, one deserves particularly to be mentioned, the hermit Peter of Amiens (Ambianensis). This individual believed himself divinely called, by visions in which Christ appeared to him, to invoke the assistance of Western Christians in recovering the holy places and the original seats of Christianity; and he brought with him a letter of complaint, calling for help, written by the patriarch of Jerusalem. He first sought an interview with pope Urban; and that pope was himself deeply affected, as well by the personal narrative of the monk, as by the letter of which he was the bearer. He commissioned monk Peter to travel through the countries, and, testifying before high and low to the scenes he had witnessed, call upon them to go to the rescue of the East, now groaning under so heavy a yoke, and of the Holy Sepulchre. Peter the Hermit was a person of small stature and ungainly shape; but the fire of his eloquence, the strong faith and the enthusiasm which furnished him with a copious flow of language, made a greater impression in proportion to the weakness of the instrument. It is to be remarked as a peculiar trait in the life of these times, that men of mean outward appearance, and with bodily frames worn down by deprivation, were enabled by a fiery energy of discourse to produce the greatest effects. In a monkish cowl, and a woollen gown or cloak over it, this Peter itinerated the countries, barefoot, and riding on a mule. Immense crowds of people gathered round him; he was loaded with presents; and from these he bountifully distributed to the poor. His words were received as the utterances of an oracle; and he made many a good use of the high influence he enjoyed. By his exhortations, he wrought a change of character in abandoned women, for whom he procured husbands, and then bestowed on them a dowry. He reconciled contending parties to one another. He was venerated as a saint; men were eager to obtain from him something in the shape of a relic; were it but a hair from his mule. A contemporary and eye-witness, who relates this, the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy (Guibertus Novigentensis),[2] says, that he does not remember having ever witnessed the like veneration paid to any man. But he looks upon it as the effect which the charm of novelty exercises on the minds of the multitude.[3] Thus, by the labors of this individual, were the

[1] See this volume, p. 104.

[2] In his Historia Hierosolymitana apud Bongars Gesta Dei per Francos, f. 482.

[3] Quod nos non ad veritatem, sed vulgo referimus amanti novitatem.

minds of men already prepared, when Urban, in the year 1095, held the church assembly at Placenza, at which he first brought this matter forward. The assembly was so numerous that no church could contain it, and they were obliged to hold their sessions in the open air.[1] At Clermont, in Auvergne, an assembly of men, of both the spiritual and secular order, was afterwards holden, which was composed of still greater numbers, because it was known beforehand that this matter, which took such hold on the universal interest and sympathy, was to be the subject of discussion. The pope, in a fiery discourse, described the importance of the city of Jerusalem in its bearing on the Christian faith, the insults and abuse which the residents of the place and the Christians sojourning there as pilgrims were obliged to suffer. Next, he invited the assembly to be zealous for the law and glory of God, and impelled by the love of Christ to grasp the sword, and turn the weapons which they had hitherto borne against Christians, and which they had stained with Christian blood, against the enemies of the Christian faith. The time was now come when, by participating in this holy work, they might atone for so many sins, robbery, and murder, and obtain forgiveness of all.[2] He announced the fullest indulgence to all who, in the temper of true repentance and devotion, would take part in this expedition. He promised forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation to all, who should die in Palestine in true penitence, and he took all participators in this expedition under his own papal protection. This discourse of the pope produced a great effect on the already excited minds of men; and after the example of Ademar, bishop of Puy, to whom the pope gave the guidance of the whole, many, on the spot, marked their right shoulder with the sign of the cross, as the symbol of the holy expedition, indicating their readiness to take upon them the cross of Christ, and follow him.

From this council, and from the impression which the itinerant monk Peter made on the multitude, proceeded an uninterruptedly progressive enthusiasm of the nations. It was like a voice of God to a generation given up to unrestrained passion and wild desires, amidst the mutual feuds and violent deeds of princes and knights, amidst the corruption which was only increased by that quarrel between pope and emperor, — a mighty religious shock, — a new direction given to the imagination and to the feelings of men. So this fire poured out upon the nations, with which was mingled some portion at least of a holier flame, became one which, as it tended to counteract the hitherto prevailing rudeness of the fleshly sense, was considered, even by the pious and intelligent men of this age, a refining fire.[3] It needed no

[1] Bernold of Constance, who relates this in his Chronicle, endeavors to show by examples that this was nothing unbecoming: Hoc tamen non absque probabilis exempli auctoritate, nam primus legislator Moses populum Dei in campestribus legalibus praeceptis Deo jubente instituit, et ipse Dominus non in domibus, sed in monte et in campestribus discipulos suos evangelicis institutis informavit. Missas quoque nonnunquam extra ecclesiam satis probabiliter, necessitate quidem cogente, celebramus, quamvis ecclesias earum celebrationi specialiter deputatas non ignoramus.

[2] It is a well-known fact that we have several recensions of this discourse and no verbally accurate record of it, so that we can only give with certainty the general thoughts.

[3] So says Guibert of Novigento, l. i. init.:

exhortations from the clergy; men mutually stimulated one another; there was a mutual emulation. People of every class, of all ages, from nations the most diverse, hastened to the appointed spot. Everything required for the journey was quickly collected together; though owing to bad seasons provisions had become dear, yet of a sudden there was a fall in the market because all vied with each other in contributing as they were able to promote the holy enterprise, as they also recognized in the abundance of the following year a special providence of God for the promotion of the crusade.[1] Thus the extraordinary movement of mind produced by the preaching of the crusade, owing to which that which seemed impossible was made possible, appeared to contemporaries as a work of God not to be mistaken. Yet the unprejudiced, even amongst them, were obliged to confess, that it was by no means the pure enthusiasm[2] for a work undertaken in the interest of Christian faith, which hurried all to take part in it, but that a great variety of motives mixed in with this. Some had been awakened, by this call, out of a life stained with vices, to repentance, and sought by joining the crusade to obtain the forgiveness of their sins. While many, at other times, were led by a sudden awakening to repentance from a life of crime to embrace monasticism, there was now opened to them, in this enterprise, a more convenient way, and one more flattering to their inclinations. They might continue their accustomed mode of life as knights, and still obtain indulgence or the forgiveness of sin. Others meditated escaping in this way the civil punishments which threatened them, or delivering themselves from the oppressive burden of debt. Others were hurried along by the force of example and of the fashion.[3]

If the religious awakening produced by the preaching of the crusades took such a turn with many as that, to speak in the language of those times, they preferred the pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem, through the contemplative life of monasticism, to the pilgrimage to the earthly Jerusalem, the spiritual contest beneath the banner of the cross, to the bodily; others, on the contrary, rejoiced at the opportu-

Quoniam omnium animis pia desinit intentio et habendi cunctorum pervasit corda libido, instituit nostro tempore proelia sancta Deus, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans, qui vetustae paganitatis exemplo in mutuas versabantur caedes, novum reperirent salutis promerendae genus.—And William of Tyre: Necessarius erat hic ignis purgatorius, quo praeterita, quae nimia erant, diluerentur commissa et occupatio ista utilis, qua declinarentur futura.

[1] Fulcher of Chartres, on the year which followed upon the council of Clermont: Quo anno pax et ingens abundantia frumenti et vini per cuncta terrarum climata exuberavit, disponente Deo, ne panis inopia in via deficerent, qui cum crucibus suis juxta ejusdem praeccepta cum sequi elegerant. In Bongars, l. c. f. 384.

[2] The men who looked upon this great movement of the nations as a work of God, still do not fail to mark the disturbing elements of vanity, self-deception, or intentional fraud. Thus the abbot Balderic, afterwards bishop of Dôle, after having cited examples of this sort in his Historia Hierosolymitana, adds: Haec idcirco instruimus, ne vel aliquid praeteriisse videamur, vel *nostratibus in vanitatibus* suis *pepercisse* redarguamur. Bongars Gesta Dei per Francos, t. i, f. 89.

[3] William of Tyre says, in Bongars, f. 641: Nec tamen apud omnes in causa erat Dominus, sed quidam, ne amicos desererent, quidam ne desides haberentur, quidam sola levitatis causa aut ut creditores suos, quibus multorum debitorum pondere tenebantur obligati, declinantes eluderent aliis se adjungebant.

nity thus afforded them, of forsaking, to follow a holy vocation, the quiet and solitude of monasticism, which had become irksome to them; and even monks believed themselves warranted to break away from their confinement and grasp the sword;[1] till at length, from a necessity grounded in the life of the times, a blending together of monasticism and knighthood afterwards shaped itself into the spiritual order of knights. Under this prevailing tone of excited feeling, men were easily disposed to fancy they saw miracles, and stories of miraculous works, wrought for the furtherance of the holy object, easily found credence, and were made the most of to promote the same, on the principle of the so-called pious fraud.[2] Men and women stood forth from among the people, and pretended that a cross had been miraculously stamped on their bodies.[3] Many branded this sign upon their persons with a hot iron, whether from zeal for the holy cause, or purely out of vanity.[4] In the beginning of these movements, an abbot was living in France who found himself unable, for want of means, to join the expedition. To obtain these, instead of mounting the cross in the usual manner, he made one, by some artificial process or other, on his forehead, and then proclaimed among the people, that this mark came from an angel who had appeared to him in a vision. This story was easily believed by the people.[5] Many rich presents were bestowed on him: he was enabled to accomplish his purpose, and afterwards became archbishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. In the latter part of his life he confessed the fraud, which was forgiven him on account of his pious motives, though doubtless there were some few who disapproved of this dishonesty.[6] It is no matter of wonder that many who, in consequence of a momentary paroxysm of contrition, engaged in this expedition, hoping to find in it the forgiveness of their sins, should suffer themselves to be so far misled by their false confidence as to let down the watch over themselves, and thus to be drawn into various excesses, for which the expedition and the climate furnished but too strong temptations.[7] But there were also to be found examples of

[1] Bernold of Constance attributes to this cause the misfortunes of a body of the first crusaders: Non erat autem mirum, quod propositum iter ad Hierosolymam expiere non potuerunt, quia non tali humilitate et devotione, ut deberent, illud iter adorti sint. Nam et plures apostates in comitatu suo habuerunt, qui abjecto religionis habitu, cum illis militare proposuerunt. L. c. p. 171.—And another contemporary, Balderic, states, in his Historia Hierosolymitana: Multi eremitae et reclusi et monachi, domiciliis suis non satis sapienter relictis, ire viam perrexerunt, quidam autem orationis gratia ab abbatibus suis accepta licentia profecti sunt, plures *autem fugiendo* se subduxerunt. Bongars Gesta Dei per Francos, t. i, f. 89.

[2] In the appendix to Balderic's Chronicle, ed. Le Glay, p. 373: Portenta et signa in coelo se videre multi asserebant.

[3] Multi de gente plebeja crucem sibi divinitus innatam jactando ostentabant, quod et idem quaedam ex mulierculis praesumserunt, hoc enim falsum deprehensum est omnino. Baldric. histor. Hieros. l. c.

[4] The Balderic, just before mentioned, who relates this, says: Vel peste jactantiae vel bonae suae voluntatis ostentatione.

[5] Indocile et novarum rerum cupidum vulgus, says Guibert, l. c. f. 507.

[6] Guibert calls it an aemulatio Dei, sed non secundum scientiam.

[7] Bernold says, in the place before cited: Sed et innumerabiles feminas secum habere non timuerunt, quae naturalem habitum in virilem nefarie mutaverunt, cum quibus fornicati sunt, in quo Deum mirabiliter, sicut Israeliticus populus quondam, offenderunt.

genuine Christian faith: captives who gave up their lives rather than deny their faith. A knight who had been distinguished from his youth for a life of piety, strict morality, and active benevolence, was taken prisoner by the Saracens, and his life spared on condition of abjuring the faith. He begged that he might be allowed time for reflection till the next Friday. When Friday came, he declared, that far from him was the desire of gaining a few days' respite for his earthly life; he had only wished to give it up on that day when his Saviour had offered his for the salvation of all.[1]

The spirit which gave birth to these popular expeditions in the name of the Christian faith, was no other than that which had stamped itself in the system of the papal theocracy; and hence the enthusiasm attending the former would necessarily give a stronger impulse to this spiritual tendency; and the light in which Urban appeared as the leader of a popular enterprise generally regarded as the work of God, could have no other effect than to establish his papal authority. What was it in the power of Guibert to do, who, supported by the forces of the emperor, ruled in Rome, in opposition to such a moral force of public sentiment as Urban had on his side? It was not till near the close of the year 1093, that the latter returned to Rome. The papal palace (the Lateran) and the castle of St. Angelo, were still in the hands of the other party; and Urban was obliged to take shelter in the castle of Frangipani, a Roman devoted to his service. His party did not venture as yet to come forth openly in Rome, and his friends from a distance visited him clandestinely. The abbot Gottfried of Vendome, a man ardently devoted to the Hildebrandian principles, who had just entered upon his office, found the pope in circumstances of great distress and overwhelmed with debt. The governor of the Lateran palace, who served the party of Guibert, offered, it is true, for a stipulated sum of money, to give up the palace; but Urban, with his cardinals and bishops, was unable to raise the amount. The zealous Gottfried of Vendome staked all his possessions to procure the sum required, and thus Urban was finally enabled to take possession of the palace which had so long been in the hands of the other party.[2]

Having accomplished such great things during his absence from the city, Urban, in the year 1096,[3] marched in a sort of triumph to Italy

[1] See Guibert, l. c. f. 508.

[2] This abbot notices his services in the cause, in a letter to the successor of this pope, i, 8. Quasi alter Nicodemus in domum praedicti Joannis (Fricapanis) nocte veni: ubi eum paene omnibus temporalibus bonis nudatum et alieno aere nimis oppressum inveni. Ibi per quadragesimam mansi cum illo, ejus onera, quantum potui, caritatis humeris supportavi. Quindecim vero diebus ante Pascha Ferruchius, quem Lateranensis Palatii custodem Guibertus fecerat, per internuncios locutus est cum Domino Papa, quaerens ab eo pecuniam, et ipse redderet illi turrim et domum illam. Unde Dominus Papa cum Episcopis et Cardinalibus, qui secum erant, locutus, ab ipsis pecuniam quaesivit, sed modicum quid apud ipsos, quoniam persecutione et paupertate simul premebantur, invenire potuit. Quem ego quum non solum tristem, verum etiam prae nimia angustia lacrimantem conspexissem, coepi et ipse flere et flens accessi ad eum dicens, ut securo iniret pactum; ibi aurum et argentum, nummos, mulos et equos expendi, et sic Lateranense habuimus et intravimus palatium. Ubi ego primus osculatus sum Domini Papae pedem, in sede videlicet apostolica, ubi longe ante catholicus non sederat Papa.

[3] In Longobardiam cum magno triumpho et gloria repedavit, says Bernold.

and Rome, escorted by troops of crusaders, full of enthusiasm for their cause, who had him pronounce a blessing on their undertaking. Thus he obtained the victory over the party of Guibert, though in Rome it still continued to maintain its authority.[1] And the pope, before so poor, now possessed wealth enough to wrest from the party of Guibert their last prop in Rome, the castle of St. Angelo. He died in possession of the uncontested supremacy, in the year 1099, after he had pronounced in a council the ban on his adversaries. In the following year, died Clement, and it deserves to be noticed that his adherents resorted to the common expedient of miraculous stories, hoping by their means to uphold his authority, and to procure a saint for the party of Henry.[2] Henry the Fourth, gradually sobered by his misfortunes, persevered until his death in maintaining the quarrel with the pope, and the latter might naturally enough be disposed to sanction any means to bring about his destruction, — even encourage the rebellion of the sons against their father,[3] provoke the shedding of blood, and palliate assassination.[4] The popes, who were ready to oppose the fanaticism of the crusaders, when it would vent itself on the defenceless Jews, with admonitions in a genuinely Christian spirit, felt no scruples, when blinded themselves by a fanatical party-interest, in employing the same instrument against the enemies of their papal authority, who appeared to them as rebels against the church, and enemies of God. When the emperor Henry, forsaken on all other sides, still had faithful adherents in the dioceses of Liege and Cambray, pope Paschalis the Second turned against them the zeal of count Robert of Flanders, who, in the year 1099, returned from the first crusade, in which he had acted a prominent part. He exhorted him to persecute Henry, that head of the heretics, and all his friends, to the utmost extent of

[1] Otto of Freisingen, in his Work of Universal History, l. viii, c. vi. says: Auxilio eorum, quos ad Hierosolymitanum iter accenderat, Guibertum ab urbe excepto castro Crescentii ejecit. Fulcher of Chartres, who was himself among these crusaders, who then came to Rome, relates how they were disturbed in their devotional exercises in the church of St. Peter, by the violent acts of Guibert's partisans; and it may easily be conceived, that retaliation would be provoked on the other side, and bloody scenes ensue, in which the crusaders must have conquered, being the majority. Yet from Fulcher's expressions it is not to be inferred that Guibert's party was destroyed or driven away by the sword of the crusaders, but rather the contrary; for he says: Satis proinde doluimus, cum tantam nequitiam ibi fieri vidimus, sed *nil aliud facere potuimus*, nisi quod a *Domino* vindictam inde fieri *optavimus*.

[2] See a report of this sort, Cod. Bamb. in Eccard. script. rer. Germ. ii, c. 173, f. 194.

[3] Those who were blinded by the hierarchical spirit looked upon the rebellion of the sons against their father as a punishment brought on him for having rebelled against his spiritual father.

[4] Men did not venture, it is true, to pronounce free from all blame those who were moved by their fanaticism to shed the blood of persons excommunicated. They were to submit to a church penance; still, however, their crime was not looked upon as properly murder. It is singular to observe the self-contradictory manner in which pope Urban the Second expresses himself on a case of this sort, when calling upon bishop Gottfried, of Lucca, to require of the assassins of the excommunicated, according to the custom of the Romish church, suitable satisfaction. Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus excommunicatos zelo catholicae matris ardentes eorum quoslibet trucidasse contigerit. Yet, in order to preserve the purity of church discipline, a suitable penance should be prescribed for them: qua divinae simplicitatis oculos adversus se complacere valent, *si forte quid duplicitatis pro humana fragilitate in eodem flagitio contraxerunt*. Mansi Concil. xx, f. 713.

his power. He did not shrink from so abusing the name of God, as to write to him, that he could not offer to God a more acceptable sacrifice, than that of carrying war against him, who had rebelled against God, and sought to rob the church of its sovereignty. "By such battles," said he, in laying down to Robert and his knights the mode of obtaining forgiveness of sin, "they should obtain a place in the heavenly Jerusalem." But while even bishops of true piety, as bishop Otto of Bamberg the apostle of the Pommeranians, through their entanglement in a false system, so disregarded all other human feelings and duties, could let themselves be so far misled, as to deny their obligations of fidelity and gratitude to the emperor Henry, and to sanction wickedness; still, the Christian sense of truth asserted its rights in opposition to the clamors of fanaticism and party-passion. This was seen in the vote of the church of Liege,[1] whose organ was the free-minded, erudite monk Sigebert of Gemblours, who in his Chronicle, where he refutes the letter addressed by pope Gregory the Seventh to Hermann bishop of Metz, stood forth as a bold and energetic opponent of the Hildebrandian system.[2]

The clergy of Liege objected to the pope, that he had exchanged the spiritual for the secular sword. "If our respect for the apostolical dignity may allow us to say it," they wrote to him, "we would say, the pope was asleep, and his counsellors were asleep, when they suffered the publication of such a mandate for the devastation of the communities of God. We pray him to consider whether he leads a beloved son in the right way, when he promises him an entrance into the heavenly Jerusalem by attacking and desolating the church of God. Whence this new example, that he who is called to be a messenger of peace should by his *own* mouth, and *another's* hand, declare war against the church? The laws of the church allow even clergymen to take up arms in defence of the city and church against barbarians and God's enemies. But nowhere do we read, that, by any ecclesiastical authority, war has been proclaimed against the church. Jesus, the apostles, and the apostolical men proclaim peace. They punished the erring with all patience and admonition. The disobedient, Paul bids us to punish severely. And how this should be done, Christ tells us, 'Let him be to thee as an heathen man and a publican;' and this is a worse evil than if he should be struck by the sword, consumed by the flames, or thrown before wild beasts. He is thus more severely punished when he is left unpunished. Who now, would superadd to God's punishment, that of man? But why should these clergymen be excommunicated? Is it, perhaps, because they are devoted to their bishop, and the latter to the party of his lord the emperor? This is the very beginning of all evil, that Satan should have succeeded to sow discord between the church and the empire." They would

[1] See the epistola Leodiensium adversus Pasch. in Harduin. Conc. t. vi, p. ii, f. 1770.

[2] See concerning this person, the Commentatio recently composed by a promising young historian, Dr. Hirsch. Sigebert designates himself as the author of that remarkable letter near the close of his tract, De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis where he speaks of himself. See Biblia theca ecclesiastica ed. Fabric. f. 114.

not presume to antedate the Lord's judgment, by which the good fruit and the tares were finally to be separated from each other. How much of the good fruit might *he* pluck away, who would cull out the tares before the harvest? A gentle hint to the pope, not to condemn prematurely. "And who can rightly censure the bishop, that holds sacred the oath of allegiance he has sworn to his sovereign? How grievous a sin perjury is, those very persons know who have brought about the recent breach betwixt the empire and the church: since they promise by their new maxims dispensation from the guilt of perjury to those who have violated the oath of fidelity to their sovereign." They object to the pope, the unapostolic harshness with which he treated them.[1] They maintained, indeed, that princes might be respectfully admonished and corrected, but that they could not be deposed by the popes.[2] They doubted, in fact, the right of the popes to pronounce the ban on princes. The jurisdiction over them, the King of kings, who appointed them his vicegerents on earth, had reserved in his own hands; a position inconsistent, to be sure, with the position maintained by the spirit of this age, and one by which the theocratical jurisdiction of the church, restricted by arbitrary limitations, would have wholly lost its importance; so that, in the end, it could only have reached the weak, while the powerful, the very ones on whom it might prove most salutary, would have remained wholly untouched. They defend, against the principles established by the popes of these times, the old ecclesiastical law, and the authority of bishops, archbishops, and provincial synods; they maintain that only on graver matters (graviora negotia) a report was to be made out to Rome. But they declared strongly against the papal legates *a latere*, who did nothing but travel up and down to enrich themselves; from which no amendment of life proceeded, but assassination and spoliation of the church.[3] They maintained, therefore, that they did not deserve the reproaches of the pope, since they had only acted according to their duty. They took no part in politics. They never attended the assemblies of the princes, but left the decision of political questions to

[1] They speak thus strongly: Eructavit cor David regis verbum bonum, evomuit cor Domini Paschasii vile convicium, prout vetulae et textrices faciunt. Petrus apostolus docet: non dominantes in clero, sed forma facti gregis. Paulus apostolus ad Galatas delinquentes ait: Filioli, quos iterum parturio in Domino. Hos igitur attendat Dominus Paschasius pios admonitores, non impios conviciatores.

[2] Concerning the papal ban against princes: Maledictum excommunicationis, quod ex novella traditione Hildebrandus, Odardus (Urbanus Secundus) et iste tertius indiscrete protulerunt, omnino abjicimus et priores sanctos patres usque nunc veneramur et tenemus, qui dictante Spiritu sancto, non animi motu in majoribus et minoribus potestatibus graviter delinquentibus quaedam dissimulaverunt, quaedam correxerunt, quaedam toleraverunt, ... Si quis denique respectu sancti Spiritus vetus et novum testamentum gestaque resolverit, patenter inveniet, quod aut minime aut difficile possunt reges aut imperatores excommunicari et adhuc sub judice lis est. Admoneri quidem possunt, increpari, argui a timoratis, et discretis viris, quia quos Christus in terris rex regum vice sua constituit, damnandos et salvandos suo judicio reliquit.

[3] Illos vero legatos a latere Romani episcopi exeuntes et additanda marsupia discurrentes, omnino refutamus, sicut temporibus Zosimi, Coelestini, Bonifacii concilia Africana probaverunt. Etenim ut a fructibus eorum cognoscamus eos, non morum correctio, non vitae emendatio, sed inde hominum caedes et ecclesiarum Dei proveniunt depraedationes.

their superiors, to whose province it belonged. The reproach fell with more justice on popes who were actuated by mere worldly pride. That, from the time of pope Silvester to Hildebrand, false popes had been judged by emperors, the imperial authority was of greater force than the papal ban.[1] Our Lord says: If I have spoken evil, show it me. Paul boldly withstood Peter. "Wherefore, then, should the Roman bishops not be reproved for manifest error? He who is not willing to be set right, is a false bishop."[2] They would not enter at present into any defence of their sovereign. "But even were he such as the pope represents, still would we let him rule over us, since we should regard it as a judgment of God hung over us on account of our sins. Still, we should not be authorized to lift up the sword against him; but prayer would be our only refuge. Why do the popes hand down to each other as an inheritance, the war against king Henry, whom they persecute with unjust excommunications, when they are bound to obey him as their rightful sovereign? To be sure, he who is excommunicated by the judgment of the Holy Ghost, is to be repelled from the house of God. But who would say that when one has been excommunicated with injustice, in respect to his cause or in respect to his person, that such an one has been excommunicated by the judgment of the Holy Ghost? Gregory the Seventh, expressed the principle and applied it in practice, that the bishop of Rome can absolve one unjustly excommunicated by another. And if the bishop of Rome can do this, why should not God be able to absolve one unjustly excommunicated by the pope? For to no one can any real injury be done by another, if he has not first injured himself." Finally, they speak with the greatest abhorrence of the fact, that the pope had promised the count forgiveness of sins on such conditions. "What new authority is this, by which impunity for sins committed, and freedom for such as are to be committed hereafter, is promised to the guilty without confession and penance? How wide hast thou thus thrown open the doors for all iniquity?[3] Thee, O mother, may God deliver from all iniquity. May Jesus be thy door, and open to thee that door. No one enters unless he opens. Thee, and those who are set over thee, may God deliver from such as betray the people." (Micah i.)

Urban's successor, Paschalis the Second, also followed, it is true, the Hildebrandian system, like his predecessors: but he wanted Gregory's spirit, firmness, and energy.[4] He reaped the reward of his own

[1] Potius depositu spiritu praesumptionis cum suis consiliariis sollerter recolligat, quomodo a beato Silvestro usque ad Hildebrandum sedem Romanam obtinuerint, et quot et quanta inaudita ex illius sedis ambitione perpetrata sint, et quomodo per reges et imperatores definita sint, et pseudopapae damnati et abdicati sint et ibi plus valuit virtus imperialis, quam excommunicatio Hildebrandi, Odardi, Paschasii.

[2] Ergo remoto Romanae ambitionis typho, cur de gravibus et manifestis non reprehendantur et corrigantur Romani episcopi? Qui reprehendi et corrigi non vult, pseudo est sive episcopus sive clericus.

[3] Unde ergo haec nova auctoritas, per quam reis sine confessione et poenitentia affertur praeteritorum peccatorum impunitas et futurorum libertas? Quantam fenestram malitiae per hoc patefecisti hominibus?

[4] Guibert of Novigentum represents him as being a weak and imperfectly educated man, in the third book of his autobio-

iniquity in countenancing the inconsiderate rebellion of Henry the Fifth, against his father; for that prince showed himself obedient to the pope, only so long as he stood in need of him for the attainment of his ends. But no sooner was he in possession of the power, than he revived the old quarrel respecting the investiture, and, after threatening at a distance, in the year 1110 entered Italy with an army. At Sutri, a treaty was concluded between the pope and the emperor, by which treaty, the contest which had continued so long, was finally to be settled. The imperial party had, in fact, in this contest, always insisted on the principle, that to Cæsar must be rendered the things of Cæsar, as well as to God the things that are God's; that if the bishops would retain the possessions and privileges they had received from the empire, they should fulfil the obligations due to the empire for them. If they refused coming to any such understanding, they should restore back what they had received from the empire, and be content with that which the church originally possessed. It might with justice be said, that the church, by usurping a province not her own, but belonging to the secular power, made herself dependent on that power; that the bishops and abbots had been misled thereby to lose sight of their spiritual duties in attending to secular business. The pope, in his letter to the emperor Henry the Fifth, might not without reason complain of it as an evil, that the servants of the altar had become servants of the curia; that they had received from the princes mints, castles, and cities; whereby they were obliged to appear at court, to take part in wars and in many other affairs, incompatible with their vocation.[1] Accordingly, those possessions and privileges which, under Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and the Othos, had been bestowed on churches, should now be restored back to the empire, in order that the bishops might, with less distraction, attend to the spiritual welfare of their communities.[2] Upon this condition, Henry the Fifth might be willing to renounce the right of investiture; and Paschalis, when he had done so, could bestow on him the coronation in Rome. A treaty of this sort was concluded at Sutri. But at that time things spiritual and secular in Germany had become so jumbled together, that a sudden separation of this sort could not be carried into effect; and men were not wanting, who called it sacrilege to think of depriving the church of that which belonged to her by long years of possession.[3] The emperor may perhaps already have fore-

graphy. He says of him: Erat minus, quam suo competeret officio, literatus. De vita sua, l. iii, c. iv.

[1] Ep. 22. In vestri regni partibus episcopi vel abbates adeo curis saecularibus occupantur, ut comitatum assidue frequentare, et militiam exercere cogantur, quae nimirum aut vix aut nullo modo sine rapinis, sacrilegiis, incendiis aut homicidiis exhibentur. Ministri vero altaris ministri curiae facti sunt, quia civitates, ducatus, marchionatus, monetas, turres et caetera ad regni servitium pertinentia a regibus acceperunt. Unde etiam mos ecclesiae inolevit, ut electi episcopi nullo modo consecrationem acciperent, nisi per manum regiam investirentur. Also Gerhoh of Reichersberg remarks in opposition to that mixing together of spiritual and secular concerns: Ducatus, comitatus, telonia, moneta pertinent ad saeculum. See his work, De aedificio Dei c. x, in Pez thesaurus anecdot. t. ii, p. ii, f. 281.

[2] Oportet enim episcopos curis saecularibus expeditos curam suorum agere populorum nec ecclesiis suis abesse diutius.

[3] When Gerhoh spoke in opposition to that mixing together of spiritual and secu

seen,[1] that the German bishops would not be inclined to let secular matters alone; and may have drawn up his plan with reference to the expected issue. But Paschalis shows himself, in all these transactions, a weak man, governed by the influences of passing events and the force of circumstances; and in the present case he acted without any calculation either of the consequences or the practicability of the treaty. Accordingly, when the emperor and the pope came together at Rome, A. D., 1111, and the treaty was made known to the German prelates, they declined giving up the regalia. The emperor now, on his part, would not consent to renounce the investiture, which he had promised to do only under this condition, and yet he demanded of the pope, since he had performed his part of the treaty, the imperial coronation. As the pope declined, and refused to recall the old veto against the investiture, he with his cardinals were arrested and imprisoned; and for the purpose of obtaining his liberty again, he concluded in the year 1112 a treaty with the emperor, by virtue of which he conceded to him the right of bestowing, by staff and ring, the investiture on bishops and abbots elected freely and without simony.[2] Had the pope held out firmly in the contest with the emperor, he might have reckoned upon the force of public opinion, which must have protested strongly against such violence done to the person of the head of the church. It is evident from the expressions of Hildebert of Mans, who was by no means a zealot, how enormous a crime this appeared.[3] He would have been venerated as a martyr. But the man who had hitherto so zealously served the cause of the papacy, for that very reason lost so much the more by *yielding*. Great must have been the impression made upon his age, when it was found that the pope, from motives of fear, proved unfaithful to the system which he had before so earnestly defended, and for which Gregory the Seventh had perseveringly fought, at the cost of everything, till his death. The name of Paschalis, as the man who had cowardly betrayed the liberties of the church, and made her dependent on the emperors, was handed down from one generation to another through the twelfth century. Thus, for example, in the propheeies of the abbot

lar concerns by the German prelates, he was in fear that he should give offence to those who said: Tales semel ecclesiis donata quacunque occasione ab illis auferentes sacrilegium committere, quoniam ecclesia rem semel acceptam et diutina posessione mancipatam non potest amittere. In the work already cited, De aedificio Dei. L. c.

[1] Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his book De statu ecclesiae, c. xxi, Gretser opp. t. vi, f. 251, says of the emperor: Haec sane promittens sciebat, non consensum iri ab episcopis praecipue Germaniae et Galliae atque Saxoniae, sed per promissa speciem quandam pietatis habentia ad perceptionem imperialis coronae per benedictionem Romani pontificis imponendae nitebatur.

[2] Ut regni tui episcopis vel abbatibus libere praeter violentiam vel simoniam electis investituram virgae et annuli conferas, post investitionem vero canonice consecrationem accipiant ab episcopo, ad quem pertinuerit.

[3] See his l. ii, ep. 21. The same writer objects to Henry his double crime against his real and against his spiritual father. Quis enim potest praeter eum inveniri, qui patres suos, spiritualem pariter et carnalem subdola ceperit factione? Iste est, qui praeceptis Dominicis in utraque tabula contradicit. Nam, ut de his, quae actu priora sunt, prius dicam, patrem carnis suae non honoravit, sed captivavit prius et deinceps expulit fraudulenter et in Deum postmodum et ejus ecclesiam insurrexit et de Sede Petri vicarium usque in vincula perturbavit.

Joachim of Calabria, towards the close of this century, where he describes the growing corruption of the church, Paschalis holds a prominent place in the picture.[1] The abbot Gottfried of Vendome loaded him with the severest reproaches,[2] and expressed a determination to renounce obedience to him, if he remained faithful to that treaty. He held up before him the example of the old martyrs, as well as that of the two apostles who laid the foundations of the Roman church. If the successor of such men, sitting on their seat, by acting contrary to their example, has robbed himself of their glorious lot, then, said he in his letter to the pope, he ought himself to annul what he has done, and, as a second Peter, expiate the fault by tears of repentance. If through weakness of the flesh he had from the fear of death wavered for a moment, the spirit should keep itself pure by reforming the works of the flesh; nor should he himself wish to excuse by pleading the latter, which at any rate must die, an act which he might have avoided, and so gained a glorious immortality. Nor could he excuse himself by pleading anxiety for the lives of his sons the cardinals; for he ought to have been much more concerned for the everlasting than for the temporal welfare of his sons; and instead of eking out a brief life to them, by exposing the church to ruin and their souls to injury, he should by his own example have fired them on to meet a glorious martyrdom; for the object, as it seemed to him, was worthy of such a sacrifice. The lay-investiture, whereby the power was conceded to laymen of conveying a spiritual possession, appeared to him as a denial of the faith and of the freedom of the church, — as a veritable heresy. He begged the pope not to add to his fault by trying to excuse it, but rather to amend it. He did not hesitate to tell him that, although even a vicious pope must be tolerated, yet the case stood quite otherwise with an heretical one. Against such a pope, any man, who did but remain true to the faith himself, might stand forth as an accuser.[3]

There were, among the adherents of the church theocratical system, two parties; one rigid and stiff, the other milder. The former, of which we may consider the abbot Gottfried of Vendome, in his then position, a representative, declared without reserve, that maintaining the right of lay-investiture was a heresy, because thereby the right was attributed to laymen of conveying a spiritual possession;

[1] Although he calls him Paschasius *the Third*, and says many things which do not agree with an exact knowledge of history, yet we can conceive of no other Paschalis that can be meant. In the Commentary on the prophet Jeremiah, we read: Libertas ecclesiae ancillanda est et statuenda sub tributo a papa Paschasio tertio. Non est plangendus, quia etsi captivus a duce Normannico (which title here is not correct), ponere debuit animam pro justitia ecclesiae et non infringere libertatem ejus et tradere servituti, de qua collum non excutiet sic de levi. See the edition of Cologne, 1577, p. 312; and in another place: The servitude of the popes began in pope Paschalis, quem dux Normannicus coepit et contra libertatem ecclesiae privilegia fecit et indulsit invitus, quae postea liberatus fregit. P. 259.

[2] Ep. 7.

[3] When, in another legal affair, he invited his assistance, he wrote to him (ep. 6): Non vos ultra modum afficiat, si qua fuit sinistra operatio, non perturbet oculum mentis vestrae regis exactio, sed quanto fortius potestis, jura justitiae in rebus aliis tenentis nunc ex deliberatione, ut quod regi fecit vestra humanitas, fecisse credatur pro vita filiorum paterna compassione.

and according to the judgment of this party, the pope, if he did not revoke that which he had done through weakness, made himself liable to condemnation, and men were authorized and bound to renounce obedience to him as a promoter of heresy. Others judged the conduct and the person of the pope more mildly, though they considered the lay-investiture as unjustifiable. To this party belonged two other distinguished men of the French church, Hildebert, bishop of Mans, and Yves, bishop of Chartres. The former was not only ready to excuse the pope's conduct, but even represented it as exemplary. "The pope," says he, "has ventured his life for the church, and yielded only for a moment to put a stop to the effusion of blood, and to desolation. Another cannot so transport himself into the critical and perilous situation of the head of the church as to be entitled to judge him. It behooves not the man living in comfortable ease to accuse the bleeding warrior of fear.[1] The pope," he thought, "was obliged to accommodate himself to circumstances. The oftentimes misinterpreted and misapplied example of the apostle Paul was employed, to the great wrong of truth, in palliation of crooked courses. Where we cannot know the heart, we ought to presume the best motives; and no man should set himself up as judge over the pope, who as universal bishop is empowered to alter and rescind all laws."[2]

Yves of Chartres declared himself, it is true, in favor of the principles promulgated by Gregory the Seventh, and Urban the Second, against lay-investiture, but he also excused the forced compliance of Paschalis. His advice was, that confidential, affectionate letters should be addressed to the pope, exhorting him to condemn himself or to retract what had been done.[3] If he did so, men would thank God, and the whole church rejoice over the recovery of their head.[4] But if the pope proved incurable, still, it did not belong to others to pass judgment on him. The archbishop John of Lyons, having called together a council at which the subject of lay-investiture as an affair concerning the faith, and the treaty between the pope and the emperor, were to be brought into discussion, Yves wrote to this archbishop a letter,[5] warning him against taking any irrevocable steps in this matter, and recommending moderation. He sought to excuse the pope, who had yielded only to force and for the purpose of avoiding a greater evil, by holding up the examples of Moses and of Paul, showing how the latter had allowed Timothy to be circumcised, in order by this accommodation to gain the Jews. "God has permitted the greatest and holiest men, when they have given way to a necessity which seemed to exculpate them, or have descended to a prudent accommo

[1] Ep. 22. Delibutus unguentis cruentum militem formidinis non accusat.

[2] Quaecunque nescimus quo animo fiant, interpretemur in melius. Universalis episcopus omnium habet leges et jura rescindere.

[3] Ep. 233. Quia verendo patris debemus potius velare quam nudare, familiaribus et caritatem redolentibus literis admonendus mihi videtur, ut se judicet aut factum suum retractet.

[4] Omnis ecclesia, quae graviter languet, dum caput ejus laborat tanta debilitatum molestia.

[5] There were several eminent French bishops, in whose name this was written Ep. 236.

dation, to fall into such weaknesses, in order that they might thereby be led to a knowledge of their own hearts, learn to ascribe their weaknesses to themselves, and to feel their indebtedness to the grace of God for all the good that is in them." He refused to assist in any council met to deliberate on this affair, since it was out of the power of any to judge the party against whom they would have to proceed: for the pope was amenable to the judgment of no man. Although he declared himself opposed to lay-investiture, still, he would not concede to those who drove the matter to an extreme, and drew rash conclusions, that the maintaining of lay-investiture was a heresy, a sin against the Holy Ghost. "For heresy," he thought, "had reference to the faith, and faith had its seat within; but investiture was an external thing.[1] Whatever is founded on eternal law, could indeed never be altered; but in that which proceeded from no such law, but was ordered and arranged with reference to certain necessities of the times, for the honor and advantage of the church, something doubtless might be remitted for the moment, out of regard to changing circumstances.[2] But if a layman claimed the power of bestowing, with the investiture, a sacrament, or a *rem sacramenti*, such a person would be a heretic, not on account of the investiture in itself, but on account of the usurpation connected with it. The lay-investiture, as the wresting to one's self of a right belonging to another, ought assuredly, for the sake of the honor and freedom of the church, to be wholly abolished, if it could be done without disturbing the peace; but where this could not be done without danger of a schism, it must be suffered to remain for a while under a discreet protest." The archbishop John of Lyons, however, in his reply, expressed his regret to find that the pope would not allow the weak spots which he had exposed to be covered.[3] To the remarks of Yves with regard to the mitigation of the judgment concerning lay-investiture, he replied: "It is true, faith and heresies have their seat in the heart; but as the believing man is known by his works, so also is the heretic by his. Although the outward act, as such, is not heretical; still, it may be of such a kind that something heretical lies at the bottom of it. If, therefore, the outward act of investiture by laymen is in itself nothing heretical, still, the maintaining and defending it proceeds from heretical principles."

Deserving of notice is the book which, amid these movements, the prior Placidus of Nonantula wrote in defence of the honor of the church,[4] as it is especially calculated to convey a knowledge of the relation in which the different parties stood to each other. This book

[1] Fides et error ex corde procedunt, investitura vero illa, de qua tantus est motus, in solis est manibus dantis et accipientis, quae bona et mala agere possunt, credere vel errare in fide non possunt.

[2] Cum ergo ea, quae aeterna lege sancita non sunt, sed pro honestate et utilitate ecclesiae instituta vel prohibita, pro eadem occasione ad tempus remittuntur pro qua inventa sunt, non est institutorum damnosa praevaricatio, sed laudabilis et saluberrima dispensatio.

[3] Utinam ipse pater pudenda (ut dicis) ista pro voluntate nostra contegi pateretur

[4] Liber de honore ecclesiae. Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, t. ii, p. ii, f. 75.

is directed partly against those who defended the lay-investiture with a view to the interests of *the state;* partly against those who, from *the position of papal absolutism*, maintained that no one could set himself up as judge over the decision of the pope. The former were led by the reaction against the theocracy, which subordinated everything secular to itself, to give prominence to the purely spiritual idea of the church. "The church," said they, "is a thing purely spiritual; hence of earthly matters nothing belongs to it but the place in which the faithful are assembled, and which is denominated a church.[1] The servants of the church can, according to her laws, lay claim to no earthly possession; nothing is due to them but the tithes, firstlings, and oblations of the altar. Whatsoever more they desire to have, they can only receive from the monarch. The church and its precincts consecrated to God belong, it is allowed, to none but God and his priests; but what the church now glorified throughout the whole world possesses, — cities, castles, public mints, etc.,[2] all this belongs to the emperor, and this the shepherds of the church cannot possess, unless it be constantly bestowed on them, over and over again, by the emperor. How should not the churches be subject, on account of their earthly possessions, to him to whom the whole land is subject?[3] If, in order to the choice of a shepherd, the agreement *of the whole community* is required, how much more must this be the case in regard to emperors or princes?" This party, in order to defend lay-investiture, appealed to the fact, that even the emperor was the Lord's anointed, by virtue of the anointing with holy oil which was bestowed on him. To these arguments Placidus replied: "To be sure, the church is a spiritual society, the community of believers, which has been adorned with the gifts of the Holy Spirit. But she should also be honored by her consecrated earthly gifts; and what has once been given to her, cannot again be wrested from her without sacrilege. Just so the worship of God, though it has its seat in the heart, — yet must appear outwardly, and present itself in a visible manner; and visible temples must be erected to his honor. According to the promises of the prophets, the once persecuted church should at length be outwardly glorified. As the soul cannot, in this present life, subsist without the body, so neither can the spiritual subsist without the corporeal, and the latter is sanctified through its connection with the

[1] Ecclesia spiritualis est et ideo nihil ei terrenarum rerum pertinet, nisi locus tantum, qui consueto nomine ecclesia dicitur.

[2] Ducatus, marchiae, comitatus, advocatiae, monetae publicae, civitates et castra.

[3] A comparison of our citations from this book with what Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his work, De statu ecclesiae, sub Henrico Quarto et Quinto imperatoribus et Gregorio Septo, nonnullisque consequentibus Romanis Pontificibus, published by the Jesuit Gretser, (t. vi, opp.) puts in the mouth of the defenders of the cause of Henry (qui pro parte erant regis ajebant), serves also to show that from these communications of Placidus we may learn what were the principles maintained by a whole party; and we see of how much importance this dispute about principles was. According to the quotation of Gerhoh, the imperial party said: "If the bishops wished to remain heads of the empire, then they must consent to be invested, like all others, by the emperor, with the concurrence of the other members of the imperial diet." Non imperio condecet, ut aliquis in principem, nisi ab ipso imperatore ex consilio aliorum principum assumatur. L. c. f. 259.

former." Many, whom Placidus calls "simplices," said, "If things go on in this way, the church will in the end absorb all earthly interests into itself." He replies, by quoting the words of Christ, "All men cannot receive this saying (i. e. few are so far advanced in the spiritual direction as to perceive how everything earthly should, in fact, be consecrated to the church); for when would all give their possessions to the church, if now they seek to deprive her even of that which has been her property for ages? The plenty which is now in the hands of the church, belongs to her no less than the little did which she once possessed. Both belong to her for the same reason, because it is property consecrated to God. The same Being who once formed her by want, has now enriched and glorified her. What would be said of the man, who should maintain, that the emperor has no right indeed to a house that belongs to one of his subjects; yet the possessions of the house belong to the emperor, in the sense that no one has a right to dispose of them, unless he receive it from the emperor? Princes should by no means be excluded from participating in the election of bishops; but they should do so as members of the community; as sons, not as lords, of the church. They should not by their *own authority* give shepherds to the church, whether by investiture, or by any other exercise of their sovereignty; but bishops should be appointed by the common choice of the clergy and the concurrence of the communities, of the high and the low, among whom princes also belong. The emperor is anointed, not that he may rule the *church*, but that he may faithfully govern the *empire*."

He next proceeds to combat those who argued that the pope could not take back his oath to the emperor, by which he conceded to him the right of investiture; those who held that no man could exalt himself over the pope, the supreme lawgiver of the church; that the laws enacted by him, although new, still carried with them the obligation of obedience. He says, on the other hand, pope Paschalis, with the cardinals, had been induced by compassion to grant the emperor Henry the Fifth, a privilege incompatible with the grace of the Holy Spirit and with the ecclesiastical laws. The pope was not bound to abide by this compact; but was bound to correct the mistake with all zeal; following the example of the apostle Peter, who after having denied the Lord through fear, sought to make up the injury by greater love. An oath, whereby one promises to do a wicked thing, cannot be binding. On the contrary, the promiser should repent for having taken the name of the Lord in vain, by promising to do what he ought not to do either with or without an oath. It must be admitted, that the pope may enact new laws, but only respecting matters on which the holy fathers have determined nothing, and especially on which nothing has been settled in the sacred Scriptures. But wherever our Lord, or his apostles, and the holy fathers succeeding them, had manifestly determined anything, there the pope can give no new law, but is bound rather to defend that which has been once settled, until he dies. Accordingly, this Placidus calls upon every man to follow the example of all who have fought for the kingdom of God, from the apostles to

Gregory the Seventh, and Urban the Second,[1] and to give up everything, even life itself, for the cause of righteousness.

It appears evident from these signs of the times, that if Paschalis had been disposed to abide faithfully by the treaty which had been concluded, still, he could not have carried it out in opposition to the superior power of the Hildebrandian party in the church. A new schism in the church, would in all probability have been the consequence of such an attempt.[2] If the most zealous defenders of the church theocratical system had hitherto been zealous also for papal absolutism, they might now take another turn, and be led by zeal for their principles to stand up against the *person* of the pope; so that from a party, of which under other circumstances such a thing was least to be expected, might proceed a freer reaction against the arbitrary will of the individual, who stood at the head of the church government.

But not only was Paschalis too weak to undertake to maintain, against the force of such a spirit, the step he had taken, he was also, at heart, too much affected by the same spirit himself, to form any such resolution. Without doubt, he had only been induced to give way by a momentary impulse of fear and weakness; and he soon began to reproach himself for what he had done; as in fact he expressed his regret at the transaction in his letters to foreign bishops.[3] He was desirous of retiring to private life; and of leaving it to the church to judge respecting what had been done. He deserted the papal palace and retired to an island in the Tiber, and could only be persuaded to return by the entreaties of the cardinals and of the Roman people.[4] It might be easier for the pope to reconcile to his conscience the non-observance of his oath, than the surrendering of any right belonging to the church. In the year 1112, he declared, before a council assembled in the Lateran, that he had been forced to make that treaty in order to save the cardinals and the city of Rome; abiding by

[1] Concerning Gregory the Seventh, he says: Pro honore sanctae ecclesiae dimicans, multas et varias tempestates sustinuit, sed flecti non potuit, quia fundatus erat supra firmam petram. Concerning Urban the Second, who at first could find no spot in the city of Rome where he could remain: Qui tamen non cessit, sed patienter ferens Christo pro se obtinente, omnis haereticorum vis destructa et ipse sanctae ecclesiae redditus apud Beatum Petrum in sua sede beato fine quievit.

[2] Gerhoh of Reichersberg relates, that nearly *all* the French bishops (which doubtless is exaggerated) had formed the resolution together, to excommunicate the pope himself, if he would not revoke what he had conceded to the emperor Henry the Fifth. Universi paene Franciae episcopi consilium inierant, quatenus excommunicarent Paschalem, tanquam ecclesiae hostem et destructorem, nisi privilegium idem ipse, qui dedit, damnavisset. See the above-cited tract, De statu ecclesiae, chap. xxii, in Gretser opp. tome vi, f. 257.

[3] Yves of Chartres says (ep. 233 and 236) of the pope: Postquam evasit periculum, sicut ipse quibusdam nostrum scripsit, quod jusserat, jussit, quod prohibuerat, prohibuit, quamvis quibusdam nefandis quaedam nefanda scripta permiserit.

[4] So Hildebert, at least, relates, in the above-cited letter, following a rumor: Renuncians domo, patriae, rebus, officio, mortificandus in carne, Pontianam insulam commigravit. Populi vocibus, et cardinalium lacrimis revocatus in cathedram. This is confirmed by the account of a trustworthy historian among his contemporaries, the abbot Suger of St. Denis, in his account of the life of the French king Louis the Sixth. Vita Ludovici Grossi, where he says of the pope: Ad eremum solitudinis confugit moramque ibidem perpetuam fecisset, si universalis ecclesia et Romanorum violentia coactum non reduxisset. See Du Chesne scriptores rer Franc. t. iv, f. 291.

his oath, he would himself personally undertake nothing against the emperor Henry; but it was beyond his power to surrender any of the liberties and rights of the church. He left it to the assembly to examine the treaty; and that body unanimously declared that it was contrary to the laws of the church and to divine right, and therefore null. The pope wished, by an ambiguous mode of procedure, to save his conscience and his honor at the same time; and while he forbore personally and directly to pronounce the ban on Henry the Fifth, still permitted this to be done by his legates. Thus the contest respecting investiture broke out anew; and with it was again connected, we must admit, the corrupt exercise of an arbitrary will in the filling up of spiritual offices by the court.[1] The emperor had it in his power to expel the popes from Rome, and to set up against Paschalis's successor, Gelasius the Second, another, chosen by his own party, the archbishop Burdinus of Braga, Gregory the Eighth.

The mischievous consequences of this schism in the churches, in which both parties combated each other with ferocious animosity, could not fail to call forth the more strongly, in all who had at heart the welfare of Christendom, the wish for a restoration of the peace of the church; these, accordingly, set themselves to devising means for bringing about a reconciliation of conflicting interests and principles. Between the stiff Hildebrandian party, and those who defended lay-investiture, there gradually rose up a third intermediate party. These controversies led to some important consequences. Various more profound investigations were thereby occasioned, into the relation of the church to the state, of ecclesiastical matters to political, of spiritual matters to secular. Men of sobriety and moderation stood forth, who endeavored to soften the extravagant excesses of the Hildebrandian zealots, in their fanatical deprecation of the civil power, and who, instead of continually harping against lay-investiture, sought to bring about an understanding on the question, as to what was essential and what unessential in the points of dispute; — as to what should be held fast in order to secure the freedom of the church, and what might be conceded to the state in order to the conservation of its rights. We have already noticed, on a former page, the milder views on this subject expressed by a Hildebert of Mans, and Yves of Chartres.

By occasion of the disputes between the Norman princes of England and the archbishops of Canterbury, the monk Hugo, belonging to the monastery of Fleury, wrote his work for the reconciliation of church and state, of the royalty and the priesthood.[2] He combated the Gregorian position, that monarchy was not, like the priesthood, founded on a divine order, but that the former sprang from man's will,

[1] In the life of the archbishop Conrad the First, of Salzburg, it is related, how pious ladies, at the emperor's court, had the greatest influence in the distribution of ecclesiastical preferments. See Pez thesaur. anecdot. nov. t. ii, p. iii, f. 204; — and Gerhoh says, in the above-cited tract, De statu ecclesiae, c. xxii: Spretis electionibus is apud eum dignior caeteris episcopatus honore habitus est, qui ei vel familiarior extitisset vel plus obsequii aut pecuniae obtulisset.

[2] De regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate; in Baluz Miscellan. t. iv.

and human pride; and in opposition to those who maintained this, he held up the apostle Paul's declaration concerning the divine institution of magistrates.[1] He affirmed, that the relations among men were, from the first, founded upon such a subordination. He attacked the exaggerations on both sides, and in opposition to them, held fast to the principle, that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Cæsar, that which is Cæsar's. The king should lay no restraint on the election of a bishop by the clergy and the community, to be held according to the ecclesiastical laws; and should give his concurrence to the choice when made. To the person elected, the king ought not to give the investiture with staff and ring, which as symbols of spiritual things belong to the archbishop; but should bestow the feoffment with secular appurtenances, and accordingly select for this some other symbol.[2] The cardinal abbot Gottfried of Vendome, as we have seen above, had declared himself so strongly against the concessions of pope Paschalis in the dispute concerning the investiture, as to pronounce the maintaining of the investiture by laymen a heresy. But he extricated himself from these wearisome and ruinous controversies, and, by certain notional distinctions, found a way of reconciling the antagonism between the church and the secular power.[3] He distinguished between that investiture which makes the bishop a bishop, and that which has reference to his temporal support;[4] between that which pertains to human and that which pertains to divine right. The church held her possessions by human right, the right which defines generally the *mine and thine*. Divine right we have in the Holy Scriptures (the ecclesiastical laws being reckoned thereto): human right, in the laws of princes. Property, which belongs to human right, God has given to the church through the emperors and kings of the world. He protested against that stern hierarchical bent, which would not allow princes to possess what was their own. "If thou sayest," he remarks to the bishop, "what have I to do with the king; then call not the possessions thine; for thou hast renounced the only right by which thou *canst* call them thine."[5] While now, in accordance with this distinction, he still declared the investiture by staff and ring, practised by laymen and referring to spiritual matters, a heresy, he still found nothing offensive in the fact that kings, after

[1] Scio quosdam nostris temporibus, qui reges autumant, non a Deo, sed ab his habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes superbia, rapinis, homicidiis et postremo paene universis sceleribus in mundi principio diabolo agitante supra pares homines dominari coeca cupiditate affectaverunt. Quorum sententia quam sit frivola liquet apostolico documento: Non est potestas nisi a Deo, etc.

[2] Lib. i, c. v. Post electionem autem non anulum aut baculum a manu regia, sed investituram rerum secularium electus antistes debet suscipere et in suis ordinibus per anulum aut baculum animarum curam ab archiepiscopo suo.

[3] Opusc. iii, to Pope Calixtus, and his tractatus de ordinatione episcoporum et de investitura Laïcorum, addressed to Cardinal Peter Leonis.

[4] Alia est investitura, quae episcopum perficit, alia vero, quae episcopum pascit.

[5] Si vero dixeris: Quid mihi et regi, noli jam dicere possessiones tuas, quia ad ipsa jura, quibus possessiones possidentur, renuntiasti. Unde quisque possidet, quod possidet? Nonne jure humano? Nam jure divino Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus. Pauperes et divites Deus de uno luto fecit, et divites et pauperes una terra supportat.

the completion of a free canonical election, and after the episcopal consecration, should, by the royal investiture, convey over the secular possessions and their own protection along with them,[1] and by what sign this might be done, was, he declared, a matter of indifference to the Catholic faith.[2] Christ intended that the spiritual and the secular sword should serve for the defence of the church. But if one of the two beats back the other, this happens contrary to his will. Thus arise bitter feelings and schisms, thus arises corruption of the body and of the soul. And when empire and priesthood contend one against the other, both are in danger. The church ought to assert her freedom, but she ought also to guard against disorganizing excesses.[3] He calls it a work of Satan, when, under the show of right, men cause the destruction of an individual, who might have been won by indulgence.[4]

The way having been prepared by investigations of this sort, a treaty was brought about, after repeated negotiations, in the year 1122, between pope Calixtus the Second and the emperor Henry the Fifth, which, concluded at Worms, afterwards confirmed at the Lateran Council in 1123, was designated by the title of the Concordat of Worms. The pope conceded to the emperor the right to bestow on bishops and abbots, chosen in his presence, without violence or simony, the investiture with regalia *per sceptrum*.

When by this concordat, the reconciliation between church and state, after a conflict ruinous to both, which had lasted for more than forty years, was finally effected, it was received with universal joy, even by those who in other respects were devoted to the Hildebrandian principles.[5] There were, it is true, some stiff zealots who were not satisfied even with this treaty; who saw a humiliation of the priesthood in the requirement that a bishop should do homage to a layman.[6] Moreover, the Hildebrandian system had for its very object to effect the complete subjection of the state under the theocratical power represented by the church: in this effort of the church, and the natural counter-action of the state, asserting its independence, was contained the germ of divisions continually breaking out afresh.

[1] Possunt itaque sine offensione reges post electionem canonicam et liberam consecrationem per investituram regalem in ecclesiasticis possessionibus concessionem, auxilium et defensionem episcopo dare.

[2] Quod quolibet signo factum extiterit, regi vel pontifici seu catholicae fidei non nocebit.

[3] Habeat ecclesia suam libertatem, sed summopere caveat, ne dum nimis emunxerit, eliciat sanguinem et dum rubiginem de vase conatur evadere, vas ipsum frangatur.

[4] Tunc enim a satana quis circumvenitur, quando sub specie justitiae illum per nimiam tristitiam perire contingit, qui potuit liberari per indulgentiam.

[5] Among whom belongs the so often mentioned Geroch, or Gerhoh, of Reichersberg. He was Canonicus at Augsburg, and master of the Cathedral school. Being a zealous adherent of the papal party, he fell into a quarrel with his bishop, Hermann of Augsburg, who defended the imperial interest. He was obliged to remove from this city, and to retire into a monastery. He testifies his joy over the Concordat of Worms, whereby it was made possible for him to become reconciled with his bishop. He says: Cessante illa commotione, in qua non erat Dominus, venit sibilus aurae lenis, in quo erat Dominus, faciens utraque unum, concordia reparata inter sacerdotium et imperium. In Ps. 133. L. c. f. 2039.

[6] As the arehbishop Conrad, of Salzburg, says: it is nefas and instar sacrilegii, manus chrismatis unctione consecratas sanguineis manibus subjici et homagii exhibitione pollui. See his life in Pez thesaurus. L. c. f. 228.

The history of the papacy in the next following times, leads us to take notice of a quarrel connected with the election of a pope, which was attended with consequences more lasting and more important than usual; — differing from all events of this kind heretofore related, in that the schism in this case did not proceed from the influence of opposite church-political parties, nor were opposite principles of church government maintained by the two competitors for the papal dignity. A schism of this sort might have served, by the uncertainty touching the question as to who was pope, to unsettle all faith in the papacy itself. Yet the most influential voices decided too quickly in favor of one of the two popes, to permit of any such result; and by the way in which the greatest men of the church labored for the cause of *this* pope, the papacy could only receive an accession of glory. It was in the year 1130, that by a considerable party the Roman cardinal Gregory was chosen pope, who assumed the name of Innocent the Second. But the cardinal Peter Leonis had also a large number of adherents. The latter was grandson of a very rich Jewish banker, who had embraced Christianity; and his ancestors, during the contests of the popes with the emperors, had been enabled to perform important services for the former by means of their great wealth, with which they supported them through their difficulties. By his money, he had himself also at that time acquired great influence in Rome. He called himself, as pope, Anaclete the Second. Innocent was compelled to yield to his power in Rome; nor was there any safety for him, even in Italy; for Anaclete possessed a powerful ally in Roger, king of Sicily. He took refuge in France; and in that country he acquired greater power than he could have acquired in Rome; for the two heads of monasticism, who had the greatest influence on the public sentiment among the nations, the abbot Peter of Cluny, and the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, espoused his interests with great zeal. More than all, he was assisted by the moral power of the abbot Bernard. This man stood then in the highest authority with the French church. In all great ecclesiastical and political affairs his voice was listened to; and it went for much with the most considerable men of church and state. In a body enfeebled by the ascetical efforts of his earlier youth, the force of his superior intellect triumphing over the frailty of its physical organ, was but the more sure to accomplish whatever he undertook. The energy of religious enthusiasm, contrasted with the pale, meagre, attenuated body, made so much the greater impression; and people of all ranks, high and low, were hurried along by it in despite of themselves.[1] Whatever cause he laid hold of, he espoused with his whole soul, and spared no efforts in carrying it. Fondly as he was attached to the quiet life of contemplation, he itinerated about, notwithstanding,

[1] How Bernard appeared and what effect he produced as an orator is graphically described by an eye-witness, the abbot Wibald of Stavelo: Vir ille bonus longo eremi squalore et jejuniis ac pallore confectus et in quandam spiritualis formae tenuitatem redactus, prius persuadet visus quam auditus. Optima ei a Deo concessa est natura, eruditio summa, exercitium ingens, pronuntiatio aperta, gestus corporis ad omnem dicendi modum accommodatus. See his ep. 147. Martene et Durand collectio amplissima t. ii, f. 339.

amidst the tumults of the nations, appeared before synods and in the assemblies of the nobles, and expended his fiery eloquence in support of the cause, which he found to be righteous. This energetic man now became a hearty champion for the cause of Innocent; for him he set everything in motion, in and without France.

After Louis the Sixth, king of France, and the French church, had already been induced through the influence of Bernard to recognize Innocent as pope, the bishop Gerhard of Angouleme, who stood up as legate for the cause of Anaclete, prolonged the contention, and by his means one of the mighty nobles, count William of Aquitaine, was gained over to the same. The latter sought by forcible measures to make the party dominant in whose favor he had declared, and persecuted all its opponents. He expelled the adherents of Innocent among the bishops from their offices. A characteristic illustration of the power which the abbot Bernard could exercise over the minds of men, as well as of the religious spirit of his times, is presented in the mode by which he finally succeeded in putting an end to the schism, that had now lasted five years. Already had he brought the count to acknowledge that Innocent was pope; and that nobleman was now only resisting the demand, that the bishops should be restored to their places. After Bernard, in an interview with the count at Partheney, had tried in vain every method to bring about the object last mentioned, he repaired to the church to hold mass, and the count remained standing by the door. Then Bernard, filled with the consciousness of the greatest of all miracles, which he as an instrument of God's grace was privileged by his priestly office to perform, elevated in the feeling of the godlike above all earthly considerations,[1] holding in his hand the plate with the host, — in which he saw under the figure of the bread only the veiled body of the Lord, — with flashing eye, not beseeching, but commanding, stepped before the count, and said to him: "*We* have entreated thee, and thou hast spurned us; the united band of God's servants have besought thee, and thou hast spurned them. Behold, here comes the Head and Lord of the church which thou persecutest. Here is thy judge, at whose name every knee shall bow. Wilt thou spurn him, as thou hast done his servants?" All that looked on were seized with a shuddering awe, and bowing their heads in prayer, waited in expectation of an immediate judgment from heaven. All wept. The count himself could not withstand the impression. Trembling, and as if deprived of speech, he fell to the earth. He was lifted up by his attendants, and again fell, foaming at the mouth, to the ground. Bernard himself now approached him, reached out his hand for him to rise, and bid the humbled man submit to pope Innocent, and become reconciled with the deposed bishops. The count dared not contradict. He embraced the bishop of Poitiers, who was presented to him, one of those to whom he had before been most inimical; and Bernard, upon this, conversed

[1] As an eye-witness, the abbot Bernald, in the account of Bernard's life, vi, 38, in his opp. ed. Mabillon the Second, f. 1107, characteristically says: Vir Dei jam non se agens ut hominem.

with him familiarly, exhorting him, as a father, never again to disturb the peace of the church, and thus this schism was ended.

Twice was Bernard called to Italy. Here also he exerted a great and powerful influence on the minds of the nations: a great deal was said of his miracles. He reduced under the pope the restless Lombard cities, and helped on the triumph of Innocent, at a synod in Pisa, in 1134. In the year 1136, the latter was enabled to march triumphantly to Rome with the emperor Lothaire the Second. Bernard also came there, and sought to destroy the remains of the schism, of which king Roger, in particular, still continued to be the support; but he did not as yet succeed. After Anaclete's death, in the year 1138, his party chose, it is true, a successor; but yet it was not with any view of defending longer his claims to the papal throne, but only in order to secure a treaty on more advantageous terms with the other party; and, in the year 1139, Innocent was at liberty to hold a Lateran council for the purpose of sealing the peace of the church.

Yet precisely at this time a furious storm broke out, by which the last years of the rule of Innocent, and the reigns of the next succeeding popes, were disquieted; events which were important on account of their immediate consequences, and as symptoms of a more deep-grounded reaction against the dominant church-system, for which the way was now preparing.

In order to find the origin of these commotions, we must glance back and trace the consequences of earlier events. We saw how the popes, ever since the time of Leo the Ninth, had placed themselves at the head of a movement of reform, in opposition to the corruption of the clergy; how, by this movement, individual ecclesiastics and monks of more serious minds had been incited to stand forth as castigatory preachers against the secularized clergy.[1] Not only such preachers, but the popes themselves, as for example pope Gregory the Seventh, had also stirred up the people against the corrupt clergy.[2] Thus there rose up from amongst the laity severe censors of the corrupt clergy. Doubtless many, who had ever contemplated the lives of these men with indignation and abhorrence, rejoiced at now having it in their power, under the papal authority, of giving vent to their long-repressed anger; and even those, who themselves led an immoral life, made a merit of standing forth against the unchaste ecclesiastics, and driving them off from their benefices.[3] From this insurrection of the laity

[1] Of such, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his book: De corrupto ecclesiae statu, in Baluz. Miscellan. t. v, p. 205, where he places the conflicts which these men had to sustain on a parallel with the earlier ones of the martyrs with pagan tyrants, remarks: Novissime diebus istis viri religiosi contra simoniacos, conducticios (the itinerant clergy hired to perform mechanically the priestly functions, who were ready to strike a bargain with any body) incestuosos, dissolutos aut, quod pejus est, irregulariter congregatos clericos proelium grande tempore Gregorii Septi, habuerunt et adhuc habent.

[2] In addition to the citations made before, we may notice what the abbot Guibert, in his life written by himself, relates concerning the effects of the Hildebrandian laws of celibacy: Erat ea tempestate nova super uxoratis presbyteris apostolicae sedis invectio, unde et vulgi clericos zelantis tanta adversus eos rabies aestuabat, ut eos ecclesiastico privari beneficio vel abstineri sacerdotio infesto spiritu conclamarent. Lib. i, c. vii, f. 462.

[3] Something of the same kind is related by Guibert (l. c.) concerning a nobleman of his district, who gave himself up to all

against the secularized clergy proceeded also separatist movements, which did not restrict themselves to the limits set up by the popes. In addition to this, came now the important and lasting controversies concerning the investiture, by means of which more liberal investigations had been called forth respecting the boundaries between church and state, and their respective rights. Pope Paschalis the Second had in fact himself publicly avowed, that the regalia were to the church a foreign possession, whereby its officers were drawn aside from their appropriate spiritual duties, and betrayed into a dependence on the secular power. And there existed, as we have already remarked, an entire party who held this opinion; who demanded that the bishops and abbots, in order to be excused from taking the oath of allegiance to the princes, should surrender back to them the regalia, restoring to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; in accordance with that precept of the apostle Paul, which required the clergy not to meddle with secular business. In opposition to the practice of mixing up together things spiritual and secular, and in justification of the oath of allegiance sworn by the bishops to the emperors, propositions like the following were already advanced: If the clergy would be entirely independent of the secular power, let them, like the clergy of the primitive church, be content with the tithes and the free gifts of the communities.[1]

It was a young clergyman of Brescia, by the name of Arnold, who gave the first impulse to this new reaction against the secularization of the church, and against the power of the pope in temporal things. From what we have said concerning the conflict of spiritual tendencies in this age, and particularly concerning the causes and consequences of the controversies about investiture, it is easy to explain how a young man of a serious and ardent temperament, brought up in the midst of such events and circumstances, might be carried away by this tendency; nor should we need to trace the matter to any other origin. But the account of a contemporary, which lets us into the knowledge of another circumstance that had an important influence on the development of Arnold's mind, is by no means improbable.[2] When the great teacher Abelard assembled around him, in a lonely region near Troyes, the youth that poured in upon him from all quarters, and by his lectures fired them with his own enthusiasm, Arnold,

manner of lust: Tanta in clerum super praefato canone (the law concerning celibacy) bachabatur instantia, ac si eum singularis ad detestationem talium pulsaret pudicitia.

[1] Gerhoh, in his book, De statu ecclesiae, published by Gretzer, (see above p. 134) says expressly: Qui pro parte regis erant sufficere ajebant ecclesiasticis debere decimas et oblationes liberas id est nullo regali vel imperiali servitio obnoxias. — Satis, inquit, apparet, sacerdotes regibus se per hominia obligantes Deo pro sui officii gradu sufficienter placere non posse. Unde, ut ei placeant, cui se probaverunt, militiam et caetera, pro quibus hominia regibus debentur, regno libera relinquant et ipsi vacent orationibus ovibusque Christi pascendis invigilent, ad quid instituti sunt. Gretser, opp. t, vi, f. 258. Here we have the principles set forth by Arnold, as they naturally shaped themselves out of the reaction, partly of the state interest, partly of the purer Christian spirit, against the secularization of the clergy, and not as they were first excogitated by Arnold.

[2] Otto of Freisingen, in the 2d book of his History of Frederic the First, c. xx: Petrum Abaelardum olim praeceptorem habuerat.

who in his early youth had been a reader in the church at Brescia, was one of the many that did not shrink from the meagre fare and various deprivations necessary to be undergone in order to enjoy the privilege of listening to the voice of that great master.[1] The speculative vein in Abelard's style and teachings did not, it is true, fall in with the peculiar bent of Arnold's mind; and perhaps even an Abelard would have found it impossible to produce any essential change in a native tendency which, as in the case of Arnold, was so much more practical than speculative. But Abelard possessed a versatility of intellect, which enabled him to arouse minds of very different structure on different sides. From such of his writings as have been preserved to us, we may gather that, among other qualities, an important practical element entered also into his discourses; that he spoke sharply against the worldly temper in ecclesiastics and monks, and contrasted their condition as it actually was with what it *ought to be*. It was the religious, ethical element in Abelard's discourses which left the deepest impression on the warm and earnest heart of the young man,[2] and, inflamed with a holy ardor, he returned home to his native city.

It was observed that he had undergone a change, a thing not uncommon among the young secular clergy, who, awakened by some remarkable providence to a more serious religious turn of mind, altered their dress, and their entire mode of life, appeared as regular canonicals, or monks, and now stood forth the bold and open chastisers of worldly ecclesiastics.[3] The inspiring idea of his movements

[1] In harmony with this is what Günther Ligurinus, in his poem on the deeds of Frederic the First, says concerning Arnold: *Tenui* nutrivit Gallia sumptu edocuitque diu. These words, it is true, might, in consequence of the relation of this historian to Otto of Freisingen, appear to be a mere repetition of the report given by the latter; but the phrase, "tenui nutrivit sumptu," may doubtless point to some other source; they agree very well with the time of his connection with Abelard.

[2] This connection between Abelard and Arnold has been doubted in these modern times. We allow, an authority so important as that of the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, seems to be against the correctness of this account; for this abbot expresses himself as if he had first made his appearance in a way altogether independent of Abelard; and had not till later, when banished from Italy he came to France, espoused the cause of that persecuted man. See Bernard, in his 189th letter to pope Innocent, § 3: Sibilavit apis, quae erat in Francia, api de Italia et venerunt in unum adversus Dominum; and ep. 195: Exsecratus a Petro apostolo adhaeserat Petro Abaelardo. We must suppose, then, that Otto of Freisingen had been led, by what he had heard concerning the later connection between Arnold and Abelard, into the mistake of representing the former as a pupil of the latter. Upon this hypothesis, we must suppose that Arnold had been led, only at some later period, by the common interest of opposition to the dominant church-system, to take sides with Abelard. The testimony, however, of Otto of Freisingen, who had himself pursued his studies in France, is of importance; and we are by no means warranted to accuse him of an anachronism, in his account of a fact not in itself improbable. The less inward relationship there appears at first glance to have been between the teachings of Abelard and those of Arnold, the less reason have we to call in doubt an account which represents Arnold as having been a pupil of Abelard. The narrative of Günther, mentioned in the previous note, which enters into particulars, agrees with the above. How easily might it have escaped the notice of Bernard, however, who would have taken but little interest in the earlier life of Arnold, that, of the great crowd of young men who flocked to hear Abelard, Arnold was one?

[3] The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg, would be inclined, with the views he entertained, to judge more mildly concerning the man who agreed with him in his attacks on the secularized clergy, but did not restrain himself within the same limits. He says of his teaching: Quae etsi zelo forte

was that of a holy and pure church, a renovation of the spiritual order, after the pattern of the apostolic church. His life corresponded with his doctrine. Zealously opposing the corruption of the worldly-minded clergy and monks, and requiring that clergymen and monks should follow the steps of the apostles in evangelical poverty and chastity, he set the example himself, by his dress, his entire mode of living, and the ascetical severity with which he treated his own person, — a fact which even his most violent adversaries could not but acknowledge.[1] He required that the bishops and abbots, in conformity with the teachings of Holy Scripture, should wholly renounce their worldly possessions and privileges, as well as all secular business, and give all these things back to the princes. The clergy should be content with whatever the love of the communities might bestow on them for their support, — the oblations, the firstlings, and tithes. The incontinent clergy, living in luxury and debauchery, were no longer, he declared, true ecclesiastics, — they were unfit to discharge the priestly functions; in maintaining which position, he might perhaps expect to attach to his side the Hildebrandian zealots. The corrupt bishops and priests were no longer bishops and priests, — the secularized church was no longer the house of God.[2] It does not appear, that his opposition to the corrupt church had ever led him to advance any such remarks as could be interpreted into heresy; for, had he done so, men would, from the first, have proceeded against him more sharply, and his opponents, who spared no pains in hunting up everything which could serve to place him in an unfavorable light, would certainly never have allowed such heretical statements of Arnold to pass unnoticed.[3] But we must allow that the way in which Arnold stood forth against the corruptions of the church, and especially his inclination to make the objective in the instituted order, and in the transactions of the church, depend on the subjective character of the men, might easily lead to still greater aberrations.

Arnold's discourses were directly calculated by their tendency to find ready entrance into the minds of the laity, before whose eyes the worldly lives of the ecclesiastics and monks were constantly present,[4] and to create a faction in deadly hostility to the clergy. Superadded to this was the inflammable matter already prepared by the collision of the spirit of political freedom with the power of the higher clergy.

bono, sed minori scientia prolata est. Which words Gretser cites, in a fragment from the first book of the work written by Gerhoh: De investigatione Antichristi, in the prolegomena to his edition of the Scriptores contra sectam Waldensium, in his opp. t. xii, f. 12.

[1] Bernard says of him, ep. 195, Homo est neque manducans neque bibens, qui utinam tam sanae esset doctrinae, quam districtae est vitae.

[2] Gerhoh of Reichersberg cites from him, in the work mentioned in the preceding note, an assertion like the following: Ut domus Dei taliter ordinata domus Dei non sit vel praesules eorum non sint episcopi, quemadmodum quidam nostro tempore Arnoldus dogmatizare ausus est, plebes a talium episcoporum obedientia dehortatus.

[3] Only Otto of Freisingen, after having noticed that in which all were agreed, adds: Praeter haec de sacramento altaris, baptismo parvulorum non sane dicitur sensisse But this account is too vague to be safely relied on.

[4] Günther Ligurinus says of Arnold:

Veraque multa quidem, nisi tempora nostra fideles
Respuerent monitus, falsis admixta monebat.

Thus Arnold's addresses produced in the minds of the Italian people, quite susceptible to such excitements, a prodigious effect, which threatened to spread more widely; and pope Innocent felt himself called upon to take preventive measures against it. At the already mentioned Lateran council in the year 1139, he declared against Arnold's proceedings, and commanded him to quit Italy — the scene of the disturbances thus far — altogether; and not to return again without express permission from the pope. Arnold, moreover, is said to have bound himself by an oath to obey this injunction; which probably was expressed in such terms as to leave him free to interpret it as referring exclusively to the person of pope Innocent.[1] If the oath was not so expressed, he would afterwards have been accused of violating that oath. It is to be regretted that the *form* in which the sentence was pronounced against Arnold has not come down to us; but from its very character it is evident that he could not have been convicted of any false doctrine; since otherwise the pope would certainly not have treated him so mildly, — would not have been contented with merely banishing him from Italy, since teachers of false doctrine would be dangerous to the church everywhere. Bernard, moreover, in his letter directed against Arnold, states that he was accused before the pope of being the author of a very bad schism. Arnold now betook himself to France; and here he became entangled in the quarrels with his old teacher Abelard, to whom he was indebted for the first impulse of his mind towards this more serious and free bent of the religious spirit. Expelled from France, he directed his steps to Switzerland, and sojourned in Zurich. The abbot Bernard thought it necessary to caution the bishop of Constance against him. But the man who had been condemned by the pope found protection there from the papal legate, cardinal Guido; who, indeed, made him a member of his household and companion of his table. The abbot Bernard severely censured that prelate, on the ground that Arnold's connection with him would contribute, without fail, to give importance and influence to that dangerous man. This deserves to be noticed on two accounts; for it makes it evident what power he could exercise over men's minds, and that no false doctrines could be charged to his account.

But independent of Arnold's personal presence, the impulse which he had given continued to operate in Italy; and the effects of it extended even to Rome. By the papal condemnation, public attention was only more strongly drawn to the subject. The Romans certainly felt no great sympathy for the religious element in that serious spirit of reform which animated Arnold. But the political movements, which had sprung out of his reforming tendency, found a point of attachment in their love of liberty, and their dreams of the ancient dominion of Rome over the world. The idea of emancipating themselves from the yoke of the pope, and of reëstablishing the old republic, flattered their

[1] Bernard's words, ep. 195: Accusatus apud Dominum Papam schismate pessimo, natali solo pulsus est, etiam et abjurare compulsus reversionem, nisi ad ipsius apostolici permissionem.

Roman pride. Espousing the principles of Arnold, they required that the pope, as spiritual head of the church, should confine himself to the administration of spiritual affairs; and they committed to a senate, whom they established on the capitol,[1] the supreme direction of civil affairs. Innocent could do nothing to stem such a violent current; and he died in the midst of these disturbances, in the year 1143. The mild cardinal Guido, the friend of Abelard and Arnold, became his successor, and called himself, when pope, Celestin the Second. By his gentleness, quiet was restored for a short time. Perhaps it was the news of the elevation of this friendly man to the papal throne that encouraged Arnold himself to come to Rome.[2] But Celestin died after six months, and Lucius the Second was his successor. Under his reign, the Romans renewed the former agitations with more violence; they utterly renounced obedience to the pope, whom they recognized only in his priestly character, and the restored Roman republic sought to strike a league in opposition to the pope and to papacy with the new emperor, Conrad the Third. In the name of the "Senate and Roman people," a pompous letter was addressed to Conrad. The emperor was invited to come to Rome, that from thence, like Justinian and Constantine in former days, he might give laws to the world. Cæsar should have the things that are Cæsar's; the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money.[3] Long did the tendency awakened by Arnold's principles continue to agitate Rome. In the letters written amidst these commotions, by individual noblemen of Rome to the emperor, we perceive a singular mixing together of the Arnoldian spirit with the dreams of Roman vanity, — a radical tendency to the separation of secular from spiritual things, which, if it had been capable enough in itself, and if it could have found more points of attachment in the age, would have brought destruction on the old theocratical system of the church. They said that the pope could claim no political sovereignty in Rome; he could not even be consecrated without the consent of the emperor; a rule which had in fact been observed till the time of Gregory the Seventh. Men complained of the worldliness of the clergy, of their bad lives, of the contradiction between their conduct and the teachings of Scripture. The popes were accused as the instigators of the wars. "The popes," it was said, "should no longer unite the cup of the eucharist with the sword; it was their vocation to

[1] Gerhoh of Reichersberg says: Aedes Capitolina olim diruta et nunc reaedificata contra domum Dei. See his Commentary in Ps. 64, ed. Pez. L. c. f. 1182.

[2] Otto of Freisingen expresses himself indeed, as if Arnold had first come to Rome in the time of Eugenius; but here he is hardly exact in his chronology. He only gathers this from the disturbances which broke out in Rome in the time of Eugenius; and the letters of the Romans to the pope, which in truth may have been written already in the time of Innocent, he places too late. The disturbances in Rome may themselves furnish evidence of an earlier visit of Arnold, though we cannot attribute everything which the Romans undertook, after the impulse had been given to them by Arnold, to his mode of thinking.

[3] Caesaris accipiat Caesar, quae surt sua praesul,
Ut Christus jussit Petro solvente cributum.

preach, and to confirm what they preached by good works.[1] How could those who eagerly grasped at all the wealth of this world, and corrupted the true riches of the church, the doctrine of salvation obtained by Christ, by their false doctrines and their luxurious living, receive that word of our Lord — Blessed are the poor in spirit, when they were poor themselves neither in fact nor in disposition." Even the donative of Constantine to the Roman bishop Silvester, was declared to be a pitiable fiction. This lie had been so clearly exposed, that it was obvious to the very day-laborers and to women; and that these could put to silence the most learned men, if they ventured to defend the genuineness of this donative; so that the pope, with his cardinals, no longer dared to appear in public.[2] But Arnold was perhaps the only individual in whose case such a tendency was deeply rooted in religious conviction; with many it was but a transitory intoxication, in which their political interests had become merged for the moment.

The pope Lucius the Second was killed as early as 1145, in the attack on the capitol. A scholar of the great abbot Bernard, the abbot Peter Bernard of Pisa, now mounted the papal chair, under the name of Eugene the Third. As Eugene honored and loved the abbot Bernard as his spiritual father and old preceptor, so the latter took advantage of his relation to the pope, to speak the truth to him with a plainness which no other man would easily have ventured to use. In congratulating him upon his elevation to the papal dignity, he took occasion to exhort him to do away the many abuses which had become so widely spread in the church by worldly influences. "Who will give me the satisfaction," said he in his letter,[3] "of beholding the church of God, before I die, in a condition like that in which it was in ancient days, when the apostles threw out their nets, not for silver and gold, but for souls. How fervently I wish thou mightest inherit the word of that apostle whose episcopal seat thou hast acquired, of him who said, 'Thy gold perish with thee,' Acts 8: 20. O that all the enemies of Zion might tremble before this dreadful word, and shrink back abashed! This, thy mother indeed expects and requires of thee. For this, long and sigh the sons of thy mother, small and great, that every plant which our Father in heaven has not planted, may be rooted up by thy hands." He then alluded to the sudden deaths of the last predecessors of the pope, exhorting him to humility, and reminding him of his responsibility. "In all thy works," he wrote, "remember that thou art a man; and let the fear of him who taketh away the breath of rulers, be ever before thine eyes." Eugene was soon forced to yield, it is true, to the superior force of the insurrectionary spirit in Rome, and in 1146 to take refuge in France: but, like

[1] See Martene et Durand Collectio amplissima, t. ii, ep. 213, f. 399. Non eis licet ferre gladium et calicem, sed praedicare, praedicationem vero bonis operibus confirmare.

[2] Mendacium vero illud et fabula haeretica, in qua refertur Constantinum Silvestro imperialia simoniace concessisse, in urbe ita detecta est, ut etiam mercenarii et mulierculae quoslibet etiam doctissimos super hoc concludant et dictus apostolicus cum suis cardinalibus in civitate prae pudore apparere non audeant. Ep. 384, f. 556. L. c.

[3] Ep. 238.

Urban and Innocent, he too, from this country, attained to the highest triumph of his papal power. Like Innocent, he found there, in the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, a mightier instrument for operating on the minds of the age, than he could have found in any other country; and like Urban, when banished from the ancient seat of the papacy, he was enabled to place himself at the head of a crusade proclaimed in his name, and undertaken with great enthusiasm; an enterprise from which a new impression of sacredness would be reflected back upon his own person. The news of the success which had attended the arms of the Saracens in Syria, the defeat of the Christians, the conquest of the ancient Christian territory of Edessa,[1] the danger which threatened the new Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, and the holy city, had spread alarm among the Western nations, and the pope considered himself bound to summon the Christians of the West to the assistance of their hard-pressed brethren in the faith, and to the recovery of the holy places. By a letter directed to the abbot Bernard, he commissioned him to exhort the Western Christians in his name, that, for penance and forgiveness of sins, they should march to the East, to deliver their brethren or to give up their lives for them.[2] Enthusiastic for the cause himself, Bernard communicated, through the power of the living word and by letters, his enthusiasm to the nations. He represented the new crusade as a means furnished by God to the multitudes sunk in sin, of calling them to repentance, and of paving the way, by devout participation in a pious work, for the forgiveness of their sins. Thus, in his letter to the clergy and people in East Frankland (Germany),[3] he exhorts them eagerly to lay hold on this opportunity: he declares that the Almighty condescended to invite murderers, robbers, adulterers, perjurers, and those sunk in other crimes, into his service, as well as the righteous. He calls upon them to make an end of waging war with one another, and to seek an object for their warlike prowess in this holy contest. "Here, brave warrior," he exclaims, "thou hast a field where thou mayst fight without danger, where victory is glory, and death is gain. Take the sign of the cross, and thou shalt obtain the forgiveness of all the sins which thou hast never confessed with a contrite heart." By Bernard's fiery discourses, men of all ranks were carried away.[4] In France and Germany he travelled about, conquering by an effort his great bodily infirmities, and the living word from his lips produced even mightier effects than his letters.[5]

[1] Gerhoh of Reichersberg writes, in the year 1148: A. 1145, a Paganis capta civitate Edessa ploratus et ululatus multus auditus est et exauditus in excelsis. In Ps. 39, ed. Pez. L. c, f. 794.

[2] In Bernard's life by his disciple, the abbot Gottfried; — the third Life in the edition of Mabillon, t. ii, c. iv, f. 1120. It is here said, that he was to present the matter before the princes and nations as the Romanae ecclesiae lingua.

[3] Ep. 363.

[4] Gerhoh of Reichersberg writes, a year after this: Certatim curritur ad bellum sanctum cum jubilantibus tubis argenteis, Papa Eugenio Tertio, et ejus Nuntiis, quorum praecipuus est Abbas Clarevallensis, quorum praedicationibus contonantibus et *miraculis nonnullis* pariter coruscantibus terrae motus factus est magnus. In Ps. 39, ed. Pez. L. c. f. 792.

[5] How great was the force of his eloquence, says the abbot Gottfried, l. c. c. iv, f. 1119: Nosse poterunt aliquatenus, qui ipsius legerint scripta, etsi longe minus ab eis, qui verba ejus saepius audierunt. Si-

A peculiar charm, and a peculiar power of moving men's minds, must have existed in the tones of his voice; to this must be added the awe-inspiring effect of his whole appearance, the way in which his whole being, and the motions of his bodily frame, joined in testifying of that which seized and inspired him. Thus it admits of being explained how, in Germany, even those who understood but little or in fact nothing of what he said, could be so moved as to shed tears, and smite their breasts; could, by his own speeches in a foreign language, be more strongly affected and agitated than by the immediate interpretation of his words by another.[1] From all quarters, sick persons were conveyed to him, by the friends who sought from him a cure; and the power of his faith, the confidence he inspired in the minds of men, might sometimes produce remarkable effects.[2] With this enthusiasm, however, Bernard united a degree of prudence and a discernment of character such as few of that age possessed, and such qualities were required to counteract the multiform excitements of the wild spirit of fanaticism, which mixed in with this great ferment of minds. Thus, he warned the Germans not to suffer themselves to be misled so far as to follow certain independent enthusiasts, ignorant of war, who were bent on moving forward the bodies of the crusaders prematurely. He held up as a warning the example of Peter the Hermit, and declared himself very decidedly opposed to the proposition of an abbot who was disposed to march with a number of monks to Jerusalem; "for," said he, "fighting warriors are more needed there than singing monks."[3] At an assembly held at Chartres, it was proposed that he himself should take the lead of the expedition; but he rejected the proposition at once, declaring that it was beyond his power, and contrary to his calling.[4] Having, perhaps, reason to fear that the pope might be hurried on, by the shouts of the many, to lay upon him some charge to which he did not feel himself called, he besought the pope that he would not make him a victim to men's arbitrary will, but that he would inquire, as it was his duty to do, how God had determined to dispose of him.[5] We have already narrated, on a former page, how Bernard succeeded in assuaging the popular fury against the Jews.

With the preaching of this second crusade, as with the invitation to the first, was connected an extraordinary awakening. Many, who had hitherto given themselves up to their unrestrained passions and desires, and become strangers to all higher feelings, were seized with compunction. Bernard's call to repentance penetrated many a heart; people who had lived in all manner of crime, were seen following this voice, and flocking together in troops to receive the badge of the cross.

quidem diffusa erat gratia in labiis ejus et ignitum eloquium ejus vehementer, ut non posset ne ipsius quidem stilus, licet eximius, totam illam dulcedinem, totum retinere fervorem.

[1] Verborum ejus magis sentire virtutem, says the biographer named in the preceding note.

[2] Of which we shall say more further on.

[3] Plus illic milites pugnantes, quam monachos cantantes necessarios esse. Ep. 359.

[4] Ep. 256, to pope Eugene the Third: Quis sum ego, ut disponam castrorum acies, ut egrediar ante facies armatorum? Aut quid tam remotum a professione mea, etiam si vires suppeterent, etiam si peritia non deesset.

[5] Ne me humanis voluntatibus exponatis sed, sicut singulariter vobis incumbit, divinum consilium perquiratis.

Bishop Otto of Freisingen, the historian, who himself took the cross at that time, expresses it as his opinion, "that every man, of sound understanding, would be forced to acknowledge so sudden and uncommon a change could have been produced in no other way than by the right hand of the Lord.[1]" The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who wrote in the midst of these movements, was persuaded that he saw here a work of the Holy Spirit, designed to counteract the vices and corruptions which had got the upper hand in the church.[2] Many who had been awakened to repentance, confessed what they had taken from others by robbery or fraud, and hastened, before they went to the holy war, to seek reconciliation with their enemies.[3] The Christian enthusiasm of the German people found utterance in songs in the German tongue; and even now the peculiar adaptation of this language to sacred poetry began to be remarked. Indecent songs could no longer venture to appear abroad.[4]

While some were awakened by Bernard's preaching from a life of crime to repentance, and by taking part in the holy war strove to obtain the remission of their sins; others, again, who though hitherto borne along in the current of ordinary worldly pursuits, yet had not given themselves up to vice, were filled by Bernard's words with loathing of the worldly life, inflamed with a vehement longing after a higher stage of Christian perfection, after a life of entire consecration to God. They longed rather to enter upon the pilgrimage to the heavenly, than to an earthly Jerusalem; they resolved to become monks, and would fain have the man of God himself, whose words had made so deep an impression on their hearts, as their guide in the spiritual life, and commit themselves to his directions, in the monastery of Clairvaux. But here Bernard showed his prudence and knowledge of mankind. He did not allow all to become monks who wished to do so. Many he rejected, because he perceived they were not fitted for the quiet of the contemplative life, but needed to be disciplined by the conflicts and cares of a life of action.[5]

[1] De gestis Friderici i, c. xl: Tanta, mirum dictu, praedonum et latronum advolabat multitudo, ut nullus sani capitis hanc tam subitam, quam insolitam mutationem ex dextera excelsi pervenire non cognosceret.

[2] His remarkable words are: Post haec invalescente multimoda impietate ac multiplicatis in ecclesia vel mundo fornicatoribus, raptoribus, homicidis, perjuris, incendiariis non solum in saeculo, sed etiam in domo Dei, quam fecerunt speluncam latronum, ego ecclesia (personification of the church) expectavi Dominum et intendit mihi et exaudivit preces meas, quia ecce dum haec scribimus, contra nequitias et impietates manifestum spiritus pietatis opus in ecclesia Dei videmus. In Ps. 39. L. c, f. 792.

[3] Multi ex iis primitus ablata seu fraudata restituunt et, quod majus est, exemplo Christi suis inimicis osculum pacis offerunt, injurias ignoscunt. L. c.

[4] Gerhoh's noticeable words: In ore Christo militantium Laicorum laus Dei crebrescit, quia non est in toto regno Christiano, qui turpes cantilenas cantare in publico audeat, sed tota terra jubilat in Christi laudibus, etiam per cantilenas linguae vulgaris, maxime in Teutonicis, quorum lingua magis apta est concinnis canticis. L. c, f. 794.

[5] The monk Cæsarius, of the monastery of Heisterbach, near Cologne, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, relates this in his dialogues, which, amidst much that is fabulous, contains a rich store of facts relating to the history of Christian life in this period, i, c. vi, for instance, concerning the effects of the preaching of the crusades in Liege. When Bernard preached a crusading sermon at Constance, his words made such an impression on Henry, a very wealthy and powerful knight, the owner of several castles, that he wished to become a

But we here have occasion to repeat the same remark which we made in speaking of the first crusade.[1] As contemporaries themselves acknowledge, these first impressions in the case of many who went to the crusades, were of no permanent duration, and their old nature broke forth again the more strongly under the manifold temptations to which they were exposed, in proportion to the facility with which, through the confidence they reposed in a plenary indulgence, without really laying to heart the condition upon which it was bestowed, they could flatter themselves with security in their sins. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in describing the blessed effects of that awakening which accompanied the preaching of the crusader, yet says, "We doubt not that, amongst so vast a multitude, some became in the true sense, and in all sincerity, soldiers of Christ. Some, however, were led to embark in the enterprise by various other occasions, concerning whom it does not belong *to us* to judge, but only *to Him* who alone knows the hearts of those who marched to the contest either in the right or not in the right spirit. Yet this we do confidently affirm, that to this crusade many were called, but few were chosen."[2] And it was said that many returned from this expedition, not better but worse than they went.[3] Therefore the monk Cæsarius of Heisterbach, who states this, adds: "All depends on bearing the yoke of Christ not *one* year or *two* years, but daily, — if a man is really intent on doing it in truth, and in that sense in which our Lord requires it to be done, and as it must be done, in order to follow him."

When it turned out, however, that the event did not answer the expectations excited by Bernard's enthusiastic confidence, but the crusade came to that unfortunate issue which was brought about especially by the treachery of the princes and nobles of the Christian kingdom in Syria, this was a source of great chagrin to Bernard, who had been so active in setting it in motion, and who had inspired such confident hopes by his promises. He appeared now in the light of a bad prophet, and he was reproached by many with having incited men to engage in an enterprise which had cost so much blood to no purpose.[4] But Bernard's friends alleged in his defence, that he had not excited such a popular movement single-handed, but as the organ of the pope, in whose name he acted; and they appealed to the facts by which his preaching of the cross was proved to be a work of God, — to the

monk, and he was encouraged in this by Bernard. He at once became the latter's companion, and, as he understood both the French and the German language, acted as his interpreter. But when one of the soldiers in the service of the said knight proposed also to become a monk, Bernard declined to receive him, and exhorted him rather to take part in the crusade. L. c.

[1] See above, p. 126.

[2] Et quidem non dubitamus in tanta multitudine quosdam vere ac sincere Christo militare, quosdam vero per occasiones varias, quos dijudicare non est nostrum, sed ipsius, qui solus novit corda hominum sive recte sive non recte militantium. Hoc tamen constanter affirmamus, quod multi ad hanc militiam vocati, pauci vero electi sunt. L. c. f. 793.

[3] Multi post peregrinationes deteriores fiunt et pristinis vitiis amplius se involvunt. Cesar. Heisterb. i, c. vi.

[4] Gottfried, in his life of Bernard, says (c. iv): Nec tacendum, quod ex praedicatione itineris Hierosolymitani grave contra eum quorundam hominum vel simplicitas vel malignitas scandalum sumsit, cum tristior sequeretur effectus.

wonders which attended it.[1] Or they ascribed the failure of the undertaking to the bad conduct of the crusaders themselves, to the unchristian mode of life which many of them led, as one of these friends maintained, in a consoling letter to Bernard himself,[2] adding, "God, however, has turned it into good. Numbers who, if they had returned home, would have continued to live a life of crime, disciplined and purified by many sufferings, have passed into the life eternal." But Bernard himself could not be staggered in his faith by this event. In writing to pope Eugene on this subject,[3] he refers to the incomprehensibleness of the divine ways and judgments; to the example of Moses, who, although his work carried on its face incontestible evidence of being a work of God, yet was not permitted himself to conduct the Jews into the promised land. As this was owing to the fault of the Jews themselves, so too the crusaders had none to blame but themselves for the failure of the divine work.[4] "But," says he, "it will be said, perhaps, How do we know that this word came from the Lord? What miracle dost thou work, that we should believe thee? To this question I need not give an answer; it is a point on which my modesty asks to be excused from speaking." "Do you answer," says he to the pope, "for me and for yourself, according to that which you have seen and heard."[5] So firmly was Bernard convinced that God had sustained his labors by miracles.

Eugene was at length enabled, in the year 1149, after having for a long time excited against himself the indignation of the cardinals by his dependence on the French abbot, with the assistance of Roger, king of the Sicilies, to return to Rome; where, however, he still had to maintain the struggle with the party of Arnold. The provost Gerhoh finds something to complain of, in the fact that the church of St. Peter wore so warlike an aspect that men beheld the tomb of the apostle surrounded with bastions and the implements of war![6]

As Bernard was no longer sufficiently near the pope to exert on him the same immediate personal influence as in times past, he addressed to him a voice of admonition and warning, such as the mighty of the earth seldom enjoy the privilege of hearing. With the frankness of a love which, as he himself expresses it, knew not the master, but recognized the son, even under the pontifical robes,[7] he set before

[1] Evidenter enim verbum hoc praedicavit, Domino cooperante et sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis; so says the biographer mentioned in the preceding note.

[2] See ep. 386. The abbot, who was the writer of this letter, relates that many who had returned from Palestine stated, quod vidissent multos ibi morientes, qui libenter se mori dicebant neque velle reverti, ne amplius in peccatis reciderent.

[3] Considerat. l. ii, in the beginning.

[4] Quod si illi (Judaei) ceciderunt et perierunt propter iniquitatem suam, miramur istos eadem facientes eadem passos?

[5] Responde tu pro me et pro te ipso, secundum ea quae audisti et vidisti.

[6] Non immerito dolemus, quod adhuc in domo b. Petri desolationis abominationem stare videmus, positis etiam propugnaculis et aliis bellorum instrumentis in altitudine sanctuarii supra corpus b. Petri. Quod licet non audeamus judicare malum esse tamen sine dubio judicamus esse a malo, eorum videlicet, qui suae rebellionis malitia cogunt fieri talia. In Ps. 64, f. 1181.

[7] His words in the prologue to the work: De consideratione: Amor Dominum nescit, agnoscit filium et in infulis.

him, in his four books [1] "On Meditation" (De Consideratione), which he sent to him singly at different times, the duties of his office, and the faults against which, in order to fulfil these duties, he needed especially to guard. Bernard was penetrated with a conviction that to the pope, as St. Peter's successor, was committed by God a sovereign power of church-government over all, and responsible to no other tribunal; that to this church theocracy, guided by the pope, the administration even of the secular power, though independent within its own peculiar sphere, should be subjected, for the service of the kingdom of God. But he also perceived, with the deepest pain, how very far the papacy was from corresponding to this its idea and destination; what prodigious corruption had sprung and continued to spring from the abuse of papal authority; he perceived already, with prophetic eye, that this very abuse of arbitrary will must eventually bring about the destruction of this power. He desired that the pope should disentangle himself from the secular part of his office and reduce that office within the purely spiritual domain, and that above all he should learn to govern and restrict himself. "From neither poison nor sword," wrote he to him, "do I so much dread danger to thee, as from the love of rule."[2] He reminded him of the shameful, spirit-depressing slavery, which he endured from all quarters under the show of rule, — he must be servant not of an individual, but of all. Nor could he rightly appeal to that saying of the apostle Paul, that he made himself the servant of all men, while the ambitious, the seekers of gain, the practisers of simony, the incontinent, and such like monsters, from the whole world, flocked to the pope, seeking to acquire or to preserve, by his apostolical authority, the places of honor in the church. That apostle, to whom to live was Christ, and to die was gain, made himself a servant to men, in order that he might win more souls to Christ, not in order to increase the emoluments of cupidity. Much rather should he ponder that saying of the same apostle: Ye are bought with a price, be not the servants of men. "What is more a servitude, what is more unworthy a pope, than that thou shouldst busy thyself almost every hour with such things and for the advantage of such men? Finally, when is there time for prayer, to instruct the congregation, to edify the church, to meditate on the divine law? And yet we must admit the laws do daily make themselves to be heard in the papal palace; but what laws? the laws of Justinian, not those of the Lord." Gladly would he invite him, according to 2 Timothy 2: 4, to put far from him all these secular affairs, so alien from his spiritual office, but he is very sensible that the times were not capable of receiving such truths. "Believest thou that these times would bear it, if thou shouldst repel those people who are contending about an earthly inheritance, and seek a decision from thee, with the words of thy Master, Man, who has made me a judge over you? How instantly would they accuse

[1] Of the fifth, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

[2] Nullum tibi venenum, nullum gladium plus formido, quam libidinem dominandi. Lib. iii, c. i.

thee of dishonoring thy primacy, and surrendering somewhat of the apostolical dignity. And yet it is my opinion, that those who so speak cannot mention the place where any one of the apostles ever held a trial, decided disputes about boundaries, or portioned out lands. I read, indeed, that the apostles stood before judgment-seats, but not that they sat upon them." This, he said, was not belittling the papal dignity or authority; on the contrary, he held it to be so exalted as to be able to dispense with managing such worldly affairs. "Your authority has reference to sins, not to earthly possessions. On account of the former, not the latter, have you received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to exclude men from it on account of their sins, not on account of their possessions. These earthly things have also *their* judges, the kings and princes of the world. Why intrude into another's province?[1] He laments that the pope's appearance, mode of living, and occupations, so little comported with the office of spiritual shepherd. He laments the arrogance and superior airs affected by his attendants.[2] He labors to impress him, above all, with the duty of exercising his spiritual office amongst that intractable, corrupt people, the Romans, who stood in especial need of it; at least to make the experiment, whether something could not be done for their conversion, and these wolves turned into lambs. "Here," said he, "*I* do not spare thee, in order that *God* may spare thee. Deny that thou art the *pastor*, the *shepherd*, of this people, or prove thyself to be such. Thou wilt not *deny* it, lest he whose episcopal seat thou possessest, deny thee as his heir. It is *that* Peter, of whom it is not known that he was ever loaded with precious stones or silks, conveyed about covered with gold on a white horse, surrounded by soldiers and bustling servants. In these things thou hast not followed Peter, but Constantine." He advises him, if he must endure such marks of honor for a short time, yet to put in no claim to them, but rather seek to fulfil the duties belonging to his vocation. "Though thou walkest abroad clad in purple and gold, yet as thou art heir of the shepherd, shrink not from the shepherd's toils and cares; thou hast no reason to be ashamed of the gospel." Not the earthly sword, but the sword of the word should be used by him against the unruly Romans. "Why dost thou again unsheath the sword, which the Lord has bid thee put up in its sheath. True, it is evident from this command, that it is *thy* sword still; but one which is to be drawn at thy bidding only, not by thy hand. Else, when Peter said, Here are two swords, our Lord would not have answered, It is enough: but there are too many; therefore both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, are to serve the church; but the first is *for* the church; the second also, from the church; the first is wielded by the hand of the priest; the second, in the hand of the soldier, at the beck of the pope, by the command of the emperor." It was then Bernard's idea that, although the pope busies himself

[1] Habent haec infima et terrena judices suos, reges et principes terrae. Quid fines alienos invaditis? Quid falcem vestram in alienam messem extenditis?

[2] Ita omne humile probro ducitur inter Palatinos, ut facilius qui esse, quam qui apparere humilis velit, invenias.

directly only with spiritual matters, yet he should exercise a sort of superintendence also over the administration of the secular authority.

But while he recognizes the church government of the pope as one to which all others, without exception, are subjected, he advises that he should restrict himself; that he should respect the other authorities existing in the church, and not usurp the whole to himself. He presents before him the great evil which must necessarily result from multiplied and arbitrary exemptions; the murmurings and complaints of the churches, which sighed over their mutilations; hence so much squandering of church property, destruction of church order, and so many schisms. If his authority was the highest ordained of God, yet he should not for that reason suppose it the only one ordained of God. The text, Rom. 13: 1, which was often misinterpreted and abused by the defenders of absolute arbitrary will, Bernard turns against them. "Though the passage, 'Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God,' serves *thy* purpose especially, yet it does not serve it exclusively. The same apostle says: 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;' he speaks not of one, but of several. It is not thy authority alone, therefore, that is from the Lord, but this is true also of the intermediate, of the lower powers. And, since what God has put together, man should not put asunder; so neither should man level down what God has put in a relation of supra-ordination and subordination. Thou producest a monster, if thou disseverest the finger from the hand and makest it hang directly from the head. So is it too, if thou arrangest the members in the body of Christ in a different order from that in which he himself has placed them." He refers to the order instituted by Christ himself, 1 Corinth. 12: 28, Ephes. 4: 16. He refers to the system of appeals, so ruinous to the condition of the church, as an example suited to show the direct tendency of the abuse of the papal authority to bring it into contempt, and also that the pope would take the best and surest means of meeting the latter evil by checking the former.[1] He warns the pope, by pointing him to God's judgments in history: "*Once make the trial of uniting both together; try to be ruler and at the same time successor of the apostle, or to be the apostle's successor and at the same time ruler. You must let go of one or the other. If you attempt to secure both at once, you will lose both.*" He commends to his consideration the threatening language of the prophet, Hosea 8: 4.[2]

But to the close of his life, in the year 1153, pope Eugene had to contend with the turbulent spirit of the Romans and the influences of the principles disseminated by Arnold; and this contest was prolonged

[1] Lib. iii, c. ii, § 12. Videris tu, quid sibi velit, quod zelus vester assidue paene vindicat illum (contemptum), istam (usurpationem) dissimulat. Vis perfectius coërcere contemptum? Cura in ipso utero pessimae matris praefocari germen nequam, quod ita fiet, si usurpatio digna animadversione mulctetur. Tolle usurpationem, et contemptus excusationem non habet.

[2] Lib. ii, c. vi, § 11. I ergo tu et tibi usurpare aude aut dominans apostolatum aut apostolicus dominatum. Plane ab alterutro prohiberis. Si utrumque simul habere voles, perdes utrumque. Alioquin non te exceptum illorum numero putes, de quibus queritur Deus. Osea 8: 4.

into the reign of his second successor, Adrian the Fourth. Among the people and among the nobles, a considerable party had arisen, who would concede to the pope no kind of secular dominion. And there seems to have been a shade of difference among the members of this party. A mob of the people[1] is said to have gone to such an extreme of arrogance, as to propose the choosing of a new emperor from amongst the Romans themselves, the restoration of a Roman empire independent of the pope. The other party, to which belonged the nobles, were for placing the emperor Frederic the First at the head of the Roman republic, and uniting themselves with him in a common interest against the pope. They invited him[2] to receive the imperial crown, in the ancient manner, from the "Senate and Roman people," and not from the heretical and recreant clergy, and the false monks, who acted in contradiction to their calling, exercising lordship despite of the evangelical and apostolical doctrine; and in contempt of all laws, divine and human, brought the church of God and the kingdom of the world into confusion. Those who pretend that they are the representatives of Peter, it was said in a letter addressed in the spirit of this party to the emperor Frederic the First, "act in contradiction to the doctrines which that apostle teaches in his epistles. How can they say with the apostle Peter, 'Lo, we have left all and followed thee,' and, 'Silver and gold have I none?' How can our Lord say to such, 'Ye are the light of the world,' 'the salt of the earth?' Much rather is to be applied to them what our Lord says of the salt that has lost its savor. Eager after earthly riches, they spoil the true riches, from which the salvation of the world has proceeded. How can the saying be applied to them, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit;' for they are neither poor in spirit, nor in fact?"

Pope Adrian the Fourth was first enabled, under more favorable circumstances, and assisted by the emperor Frederic the First,[3] to deprive the Arnold party of its leader, and then to suppress it entirely. It so happened that, in the first year of Adrian's reign, 1155, a cardinal, on his way to visit the pope, was attacked and wounded by followers of Arnold. This induced the pope to put all Rome under the interdict, with a view to force the expulsion of Arnold and his party. This means did not fail of its effect. The people, who could not bear the suspension of divine worship, now themselves compelled the nobles to bring about the ejection of Arnold and his friends. Arnold, on leaving Rome, found protection from Italian nobles. By the order, however, of the emperor Frederic, who had come into Italy,

[1] Rusticana quaedam turba absque nobilium et majorum scientia, as pope Eugenius himself writes. Martene et Durand, collectio amplissima, t. ii, f. 554.

[2] See the letter, written in the name of this party and expressing its views, by a certain Wezel, to the emperor Frederic the First, in the year 1152, in the collection mentioned in the note preceding, t. ii, f. 554.

[3] Pope Eugene had taken advantage of the above-mentioned plan of one portion of Arnold's party to represent that party to the emperor as detrimental even to the imperial interests. The words of Eugene, in the letter already mentioned in a preceding note, addressed to the emperor's envoy, the abbot Wibald, are: Quod quia contra coronam regni et carissimi filii nostri, Friderici Romanorum regis, honorem attentare praesumunt, eidem volumus per te secretius nuntiari.

he was torn from his protectors, and surrendered up to the papal authority. The prefect of Rome then took possession of his person and caused him to be hung. His body was burned, and its ashes thrown into the Tiber, lest his bones might be preserved as the relics of a martyr by the Romans, who were enthusiastically devoted to him.[1] Worthy men, who were in other respects zealous defenders of the church orthodoxy and of the hierarchy, as, for example, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, expressed their disapprobation, first, that Arnold should be punished with death on account of the errors which he disseminated; secondly, that the sentence of death should proceed from a *spiritual* tribunal, or that such a tribunal should at least have subjected itself to that bad appearance. But on the part of the Roman court it was alleged, in defence of this proceeding, that "it was done without the knowledge and contrary to the will of the Roman curia." "The prefect of Rome had forcibly removed Arnold from the prison where he was kept, and his servants had put him to death in revenge for injuries they had suffered from Arnold's party. Arnold, therefore, was executed, not on account of his doctrines, but in consequence of tumults excited by himself." It may be a question whether this was said with sincerity, or whether, according to the proverb, a confession of guilt is not implied in the excuse. But Gerhoh was of the opinion, that in this case they should at least have done as David did, in the case of Abner's death (2 Sam. 3), and, by allowing Arnold to be buried, and his death to be mourned over, instead of causing his body to be burned, and the remains thrown into the Tiber, washed their hands of the whole transaction.[2]

But the idea for which Arnold had contended, and for which he died, continued to work in various forms even after his death, — the idea of a purification of the church from the foreign worldly elements with which it had become vitiated, of its restoration to its original spiritual character. Even the person who had given over Arnold to the power of his enemies, the emperor Frederic, must afterwards attach himself — though induced by motives of a different kind, by the interest of politics — to a tendency of this sort. With this emperor begins a new epoch in

[1] See Acta Vaticana, in Baronius, annal. ad a. 1155, No. i, et iv, and Otto of Freisingen de gestis, f. i, l. ii, c. xx.

[2] Gerhoh's noticeable words concerning Arnold: Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrina sua, quamvis prava, vel exilio vel carcere aut alia poena praeter mortem punitum esse vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Romana ecclesia seu curia ejus necis quaestione careret. Nam, sicut ajunt, absque ipsorum scientia et consensu a praefecto urbis Romae de sub eorum custodia, in qua tenebatur, ereptus ac pro speciali causa occisus ab ejus servis est; maximam siquidem cladem ex occasione ejusdem doctrinae (in which, therefore, it seems to be implied, that Arnold's principles had only given occasion to the tumult, not that he himself had created it), idem praefectus a Romanis civibus perpessus fuerat; quare non saltem ab occisi crematione ac submersione ejus occisores metuerunt? Quatenus a domo sacerdotali sanguinis quaestio remota esset, sicut David quondam honestas Abner exequias providit atque ante ipsas flevit, ut sanguinem fraudulenter effusum a domo ac throno suo removeret. Sed de his ipsi viderint. Nihil enim super his nostra interest, nisi cupere matri nostrae, sanctae Romanae ecclesiae id quod bonum justum et honestum est. It was important for him to make this declaration: ne videatur neci ejus perperam actae assensum praebere. See Gretser's Werke, t. xii, in the prolegomena to the writings against the Waldenses, f. 12.

the history of the papacy, — the hundred years controversy of the popes with the emperors of the Hohenstaufen family. It was not, as formerly, the contest of the pope with princes who stood singly opposed to him, and acted rather by momentary interests than according to a fixed plan; but a contest, which was perseveringly maintained by three princes, following one after the other in immediate succession, with all the power, energy, and craft of a consistent plan, — which, after every momentary pause occasioned by particular circumstances, was resumed with the same vigor as before. Here it was to be decided whether the papacy could be overturned by any force from without, or must only come forth triumphant out of such a conflict.

When Frederic came into Italy for the first time, and Rome was already filled with alarm, the issue showed that these fears were groundless. The emperor sought to maintain a good understanding with the pope, — whether it was that he had it in view to establish his power on a firm footing in Italy, before he embarked in this dangerous contest, or that he was disposed to try whether he might not obtain the pope's coöperation in accomplishing his objects.[1] If the latter was his plan, he must at least have soon convinced himself, that this thing was impossible. The churchly theocratical system could tolerate *no* power beside itself; but it required of every other unconditional subjection. Its unyielding pretensions Frederic soon came to find out, in disputing the question whether he was bound to hold the stirrup for the pope,[2] and in beholding those pictures and inscriptions in the papal palaces, which represented the pope as liege-lord of the empire.[3]

[1] The remarkable words of John of Salisbury, who to be sure was very hostilely disposed towards the imperial interest, are (ep. 59): Scio quid Teutonicus moliatur. Eram enim Romae praesidente b. Eugenio, quando prima legatione missa in regni sui initio, tanti ausi impudentiam, tumor intolerabilis, lingua incauta detexit. Promittebat enim, se totius orbis reformaturum imperium, urbi subjiciendum orbem, eventuque facili omnia subacturum, si ei ad hoc solius Romani pontificis favor adesset. Id enim agebat, ut in quemcunque demutatis inimiciiis materialem gladium imperator, in eundem Romanus pontifex spiritualem gladium exereret. Therefore, the idea of a universal politico-spiritual monarchy.

[2] The fabulous story was handed round that the emperor Constantine had done this act of homage to pope Silvester, and good use was made of it in an uncritical age. We take this from Gerhoh's words, in his Syntagma de statu ecclesiae, c. xxiv, Gretser, t. vi. fol. 258: Cui ad honoris cumulum et ipse Constantinus tenens frenum per civitatem stratoris officium exhibuit. In another place, Gerhoh extols this triumph of the hierarchy in the following noticeable words: Regnis idololatris, schismaticis atque indisciplinatis usque ad sui fastus defectum curvatis amplius glorificanda et coronanda erat sacerdotalis dignitas, ita ut stratoris quoque officium pontifici Romano a regibus et imperatoribus exhibendum sit. In him we have a strikingly characteristic representative of the spirit of this party, when intoxicated by his enthusiasm for the universally triumphant priesthood, he sees in the future a goal to be reached, where small princes of inferior name should arise in place of the imperial dignity; princes, who could undertake nothing in opposition to the church. Haec nimirum spectacula (says he, after the passage just cited), nunc regibus partim ablatis, partim diminuto eorum regno humilitatis, et exaltato sacerdotio delectant spectatorem benevolum, torquent invidum, qui ut amplius crucietur et pius oculus magis jucundetur, etc., succedet in saeculari dignitate minoris nominis potestas diminutis regnis magnis in tetrarchias aut minores etiam particulas, ne premere valeant ecclesias et ecclesiasticas personas. In Ps. 64, l. c. f. 1190.

[3] To paintings, which symbolically represented the principles of the papal system, John of Salisbury also alludes, in the letter already referred to: Sic ad gloriam patrum teste Lateranensi palatio, ubi hoc in visibilibus picturis et laici legunt, ad gloriam patrum schismatici, quos saecularis potestas intrusit, dantur pontificibus pre scabello.

The resolution was now matured in the emperor's mind, that he would take advantage of the first opportunity to resist these papal pretensions. Such an opportunity was soon furnished, perhaps undesignedly, by the pope himself. A bishop of Lund, in Sweden, when returning from a pilgrimage to Rome, was robbed and taken captive by certain German knights. The pope complained to the emperor in a letter, of the year 1157, that he had let this offence go unpunished, and had not taken the side of the bishop. He reminded him of the gratitude which he owed to the papal chair, of the services which that chair had rendered him during his stay at Rome, and mentioned, among other particulars, the *bestowment of the imperial crown*, as if this depended on the pope's determination.[1] Still, he added, the pope would not have regretted it, had he received, if that were possible, still greater benefits from him.[2] When this was read before the emperor, in the diet held at Besançon, it produced a strong and universal movement of surprise. Not without reason might offence be taken at the language in which the pope spoke of the bestowment of the imperial crown; and,—by putting this in conjunction with what was said about benefits, the emperor recollecting all the while those pictures and inscriptions which he had seen at Rome,[3]—the worst construction which could be put on the word "*beneficium*," according to the use of language in that period, as designating a feoffage, was put upon the pope's language, though the connection was decidedly against any such construction. The papal legates, who had brought the letter, were little fitted by their temper to quiet the excited feelings of the assembly. One of them, Cardinal Roland of Siena, chancellor of the church of Rome, on offence being taken at those words of the papal letter, had the boldness to ask, "From whom then did the emperor obtain the government, if not from the pope?" These words produced such an outburst of anger, that a terrible vengeance would have lighted on the head of the speaker, if he had not been protected by the emperor. The legates were dismissed with disgrace; they were commanded to return immediately to Rome, and to visit no bishop or abbot by the way, lest, in travelling about the empire, they might find opportunity of creating disturbances, or of exacting contributions.[4] For the same reason, the emperor laid a restriction upon

[1] Quantam tibi (Romana ecclesia) dignitatis plenitudinem contulerit et honoris et qualiter imperialis insigne coronae libentissime conferens.

[2] Si majora beneficia excellentia tua de manu nostra suscepisset, si fieri posset.

[3] The picture of the emperor Lothaire the Second, on whom the pope bestows the imperial crown, with the inscription:—

Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores
Post homo fit Papae, sumit quo dante coronam.

According to the account of the historian Radwic (i, 10), the pope had promised, in reply to the friendly remonstrances of the emperor, that this picture should be removed.

[4] The words in the emperor's letter, in which he notices this, and explains his motives: Porro quia multa paria literarum apud eos reperta sunt et schedulae sigillatae ad arbitrium eorum adhuc scribendae (namely, blank leaves to which the pope's seal had been affixed, which they were to fill up according to circumstances; so great was the power intrusted to them), quibus sicut hactenus consuetudinis eorum fuit, per singulas ecclesias Teutonici regni conceptum iniquitatis suae virus respergere, altaria denudare, vasa domus Dei apportare, cires excoriare nitebantur. A description of the exactions made by the papal legates, which we assuredly cannot

that constant and lively intercourse which had been hitherto kept up between Germany and Rome, by means of pilgrimages and appeals. He endeavored to provide that his conduct towards the pope should everywhere be seen in a favorable point of light. He therefore caused to be published throughout the whole empire, a document setting forth what had been done, and the reasons which made it necessary to take such a course. In this paper he styled himself, in opposition to the papal pretensions, "the Lord's anointed," who had obtained the government from that Almighty power from which proceeds all authority in heaven and on earth. "Since our government," he declared, "proceeds, through the choice of the princes, from God alone; since our Lord, at his passion, committed the government of the world to two swords, and since the apostle Peter gave to the world this precept, 'Fear God, and honor the king,' it is evident, that whoever says, 'we received the imperial crown as a *beneficium* from the pope,' contradicts the divine order and the doctrine of Peter, and makes himself guilty of a lie." The pope, first in a letter issued to the German bishops, complained bitterly of this procedure on the part of the emperor, and called upon them to use the influence they had with him, to bring him to his senses. But the bishops were here of one and the same mind with the emperor. They handed over this letter to him, and he communicated to them the draft of a reply which he intended for the pope. In this, he declared that he was ready to pay all due respect to the head of the church; but he was also resolved to maintain the independence of his imperial throne. "It was not," he said, "his design to hinder those who made the pilgrimage to Rome with certificates from their ecclesiastical superiors, or on other good grounds; but he only intended to resist those abuses of which he could justly say, that all the churches of his empire were burdened with them, and all the discipline of the monasteries destroyed by them."[1] "In the head city of the world," he writes, "God exalted the church by means of the empire; in the head city of the world, the church now seeks, not through God, as we think, to destroy the empire. She began with pictures; from pictures she proceeded to writings; these writings would procure for themselves the authority of law. Sooner will we lay down our crown, than suffer it, together with ourselves, to be so degraded. The pictures must be destroyed; the writings must be revoked, so that the monuments of the controversy between the empire and the priesthood may not last forever."[2] The bishops, in transmitting this declaration of the emperor to the pope, assured him that those words of his own letter had excited the greatest displeasure amongst all the German princes, as well as in the emperor; that they themselves could not defend those words, because of their am-

regard as exaggerated, judging from a comparison with other accounts of these times.

[1] Illis abusionibus, quibus omnes ecclesiae regni nostri gravatae et attentatae sunt et omnis paene claustrales disciplinae emortuae et sepultae, obviare intendimus

[2] Picturae deleantur, scripturae retractentur, ut inter regnum et sacerdotium aeterne inimicitiarum monumenta non remaneant.

biguity. They represented to him the great danger which might grow out of this dispute, and besought him earnestly, that he would seek to pacify the emperor by a conciliatory letter.

As the emperor now marched into Italy with an army, fear added weight, in the pope's mind, to the representations of the bishops. He sent a second legation to the emperor, for which he selected two cardinals who were free from that hierarchical obstinacy, and adroit men of the world. These envoys handed over to the emperor another letter, which, by a milder explanation of those words which had given offence, was designed to pacify him. Against the construction which the emperor had put on the word *beneficium*, he could easily defend himself, by an appeal to etymology, to the common Latin *usus loquendi*, and at the same time to the Bible.[1] In respect also to the other difficulty, he maintained that his language had been misconstrued, but without entering into more distinct explanations.[2]

Thus, for the present, the good understanding between the emperor and the pope was again restored; still, however, in a case where interests and principles were so directly opposed, this could not last long; and the sojourn of the emperor in Italy, in the year 1158, where with good success he was seeking to establish his power on a firm foundation, could not fail to produce many a collision between the two. The pope could not pardon it in the emperor, that he insisted on his right of sovereignty over the city of Rome, caused the bishops to take the oath of allegiance, placed a limit on appeals to Rome, and sought to check the influence of the papal legates in Germany. In this uneasy state of feeling, he wrote to the emperor a short letter, complaining of his want of respect to the apostle Peter and to the church of Rome. What arrogance was it, that in his letter to the pope, he should place his own name before that of the pope. How grossly he violated the fidelity vowed to St. Peter, when he required of those who are all gods and sons of the Highest, the oath of allegiance, and took their holy hands into his. He reproached him with having shut out the churches and states of his empire from the papal legates. He exhorted him to repentance. In the reply to this letter a mode of thinking expressed itself, which required the separation of spiritual things from secular, in the case of the church of Rome as well as of other churches. The very superscription itself plainly indicated the emperor's views, in the wish there expressed, that he might remain faithful and true to all that Jesus had taught by word and deed. He denied that the popes held worldly possessions by divine right; they were indebted for all they possessed to the donations of monarchs, as Silvester first had received all he possessed from the emperor Constantine. It was by ancient right that, in his letters to the pope, he placed his own name first; and the pope was free to do the same thing in writing to the emperor. He acknowledged the higher

[1] Hoc nomen ex bono et facto est editum et dicitur beneficium apud nos non feudum, sed bonum factum.

[2] Per hoc vocabulum (the offensive word "contulimus)," nihil aliud intelleximus, nisi quod superius dictum est imposuimus.

consecrated character of the bishops; but it seemed to him not in the least incompatible with this, that he should require them to take the oath of allegiance; and he appeals to the pattern of Christ: "Whereas your Master and mine, who needed not that anything should be given him by a king who was a man, but bestows every good upon all, paid for himself and Peter the tribute-money to Cæsar, and also set the example of so acting, when he said, 'Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart,' so you therefore should leave to us the regalia,—or, if you expect to derive advantage from it, you should 'render to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.'" The churches and countries he had shut out from the cardinals, because they did not come to preach, to make and to establish peace, but to plunder, and to gratify their insatiable cupidity. Should such men come, however, as the good of the church required that bishops should be, he would not delay providing them with everything needful. The emperor asked the pope to consider how incongruous it was with the humility and meekness of which, as Christ's vicegerent, he should set the example, for him to excite disputes about such things; and in what an unfavorable light he must place himself thereby before the eyes of the world! After long-continued negotiations, the dispute between the pope and the emperor was as far from being settled as ever. Already was Adrian on the point of proceeding to more violent measures against that monarch, when, precisely at this critical moment, in the year 1159, he died.

The death of Adrian at this point of time was necessarily followed by a schism in the choice of a pope; for there were, as usual, two parties among the cardinals; one, which was determined to maintain, at all hazards, the pretensions of the hierarchical system, and to employ for this purpose the strongest and most violent measures; the other, which was inclined to more moderate proceedings. The former, at whose head had stood the deceased pope himself, was for uniting itself with the enemies of the emperor in Italy and Sicily, and pronouncing the ban upon him; the other, to which those cardinals belonged who already under the preceding reign had pushed forward the negotiations with the emperor, wished for a peaceable termination of the difficulties. The first party chose as pope the cardinal Roland, of Siena, and he assumed the name of Alexander the Third; the second party chose the cardinal Octavian, who gave himself the name of Victor the Fourth. The emperor could not doubt for a moment, which of these two parties was the most favorably disposed to his own interest; as the two popes themselves plainly expressed their different principles by the different tone in which they addressed him. But he was very far from being disposed to intermeddle with the inner affairs of the church; he only meant to take advantage of this strife so as to be able, after the example of the Othos, and of Henry the Third, to hit upon the legitimate measures for the removal of the present schism, and the establishment of a universally recognized pope. He announced a church assembly to meet in the year 1160 at Pavia, before which the two competitors should appear, in

order that their respective claims to the papal dignity might then be scrutinized. But Alexander, without regard to any further scrutiny, considered himself as the only regular pope, and declared it to be an unheard-of pretension, that a layman should presume to set himself up as judge over such an affair. He looked upon the council at Pavia as an altogether disorderly assembly. Victor, on the other hand, recognized this tribunal. When the council had assembled, the emperor declared he had now done all that belonged to *his* vocation; nothing else remained for him than to await the decision of God, through those whom he had appointed the judges in this matter; whereupon he withdrew from the transactions. The council recognized Victor as the regular pope, and Frederic sought to promote his authority by every means of power and of influence within his command. But although Alexander was compelled to yield to the authority of the emperor, and in the year 1162 to seek a refuge in France, yet he continually gained more and more on his side the public opinion in the church; the heads of the clerical and of the monastic orders stood up for him, or demanded a true general council, as alone competent to decide this controversy.[1] All who were devoted to the church theocratical system, saw in Alexander the champion of a holy cause; and in Victor, a tool of the imperial power.[2] Alexander too, like his predecessors, was greatly indebted to the influence of the monks.[3]

Still less authority than Victor's was enjoyed by his successors nominated by the imperial party, Paschalis the Third (1164), and Calixtus the Third (1168). The tyranny which the emperor exercised in Italy, the struggle of the Longobard states for their freedom, procured allies for the pope, with whom he could constantly fortify himself more strongly against the emperor; and after the unfortunate campaign in Italy, in 1176, Frederic was induced to conclude at Venice a peace with the pope, upon conditions prescribed by the latter. This victory was interpreted by the adherents of the church theo-

[1] So the provost Gerhoh, who calls the assembly at Pavia only a "curia Papiensis," in Ps. 133, f. 1042.

[2] So Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, or John of Salisbury, in his name, (ep. 48, in the letter of J. of Salisbury), in a letter to king Henry the Second, of England, whom the emperor was seeking to gain over to Victor: Absit, ut in tanto periculo ecclesiae pro amore et honore hominis faciatis, nisi quod crederetis Domino placiturum, nec decet majestatem vestram, si placet, ut in tota ecclesia regni vestri superponatis hominem, qui sine electione, ut publice dicitur, sine gratia Domini per favorem unius imperatoris tantum honorem ausus est occupare. Nam tota fere ecclesia Romana in parte Alexandri est. Incredibile autem est, quod pars illa possit obtinere, praevalere per hominem, cui justitia deest, cui Dominus adversatur. He then cites the example of the popes, since the time of Urban the Second, who began in weakness, and, after having been acknowledged in France, triumphed over their opponents. John of Salisbury declares, very strongly, his opposition to the council of Pavia: Universalem ecclesiam quis particularis ecclesiae subjecit judicio? Quis Teutonicos constituit judices nationum? Quis hanc brutis, impetuosis hominibus auctoritatem contulit, ut pro arbitrio principem statuant super capita filiorum hominum?

[3] In the life of bishop Anthelm, by Bellay, in the Actis Sanctor. Jun. t. v, c. iii, f. 232, it is stated that quum universa paene anceps ecclesia vacillaret, the Carthusian order, at first, used their influence in favor of Alexander: Praecedentibus itaque Cartusiensibus et Cisterciensibus Alexander papa ecclesiarum in partibus Galliae, Britanniae atque Hispaniae cito meruit obedientiam habere.

cratical system as a judgment of God in favor of the papacy.[1] The seal was set to this victory by the Lateran council, which Alexander, as universally acknowledged pope, held in the year 1179, and by which an ordinance was passed in relation to papal elections, in order to prevent similar schisms to those which had recently occurred. It was thereby determined,[2] that the individual chosen by the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals should be lawful pope; and in case the person chosen by the minority, consisting of the other third, should set himself up as pope in opposition, he and his adherents should be liable to excommunication.

Still stronger did the power of the papacy exhibit itself in another contest, between the secular power and the church, which arose in another quarter, namely England. Thomas Becket had come as arch deacon to the court of king Henry the Second of England, and, getting more and more into the confidence of that monarch, was finally appointed chancellor, in which post his word became law. Without doubt, the king supposed that he should most certainly promote his own interest, if, availing himself of the vacancy of the archbishopric of Canterbury, in the year 1162, he proceeded to make his favorite, the man hitherto so devoted to him, primate of the English church, while at the same time he allowed him to continue in the same relations to himself, as his chancellor. But he found himself altogether deceived in his expectations; for Thomas Becket from that moment changed entirely the whole mode of his life,[3] and with still greater zeal served the interest of the hierarchy, than he had before served the interests of the king. It was to him an affair of conscience, not to surrender a tittle of anything pertaining to the cause of the church, and to the dignity of the priesthood, contemplated from the hierarchical point of view which was common at that time.[4] When he resigned

[1] Thus wrote John of Salisbury, who from this result entertained the hope that the contest for the interest of the church in England would have a like issue (ep. 254): Nam quae capiti schismatis confurebant membra cointereunt eoque succiso corpus totum necesse est interire. Vidimus, vidimus hominem, qui consueverat esse sicuti leo in domo sua, domesticos evertens et opprimens subjectos sibi, latebras quaerere et tanto terrore concuti, ut vix tutus esset in angulosis abditis suis. Illum, illum imperatorem, qui totius orbis terror fuerat, utinam vidissetis ab Italia fugientem cum ignominia sempiterna, ut his cautelam procuret aut ruinam, qui catholicorum laboribus insultabant ex successibus et furore ejus. Ergo conceptam laudem Dei silere quis poterit? Ipse enim est, qui facit mirabilia magna solus.

[2] Can. i.

[3] Still he could not be induced, through his ascetic zeal, to make any such alterations in his diet as were too much at variance with his previous habits: and when once, at the common table of the clergy, a pheasant was placed before him, said he to one of his companions at the table, who took offence at it: Truly, my brother, if I do not mistake, thou eatest thy beans with more relish, than I do the pheasant set before me." See his life by Heribert of Bosham (ed. sup.), with the letters of Thomas, in the collection of the four lives, p. 25.

[4] The bishop's zealous friend, John of Salisbury, expresses himself somewhat dissatisfied with his rough and stern proceedings at the outset: Novit cordium inspector, et verborum judex et operum, quod sacpius et asperius, quam aliquis mortalium corripuerim archiepiscopum de his, in quibus ab initio dominum regem et suos zelo quodam inconsultius visus est ad amaritudinem provocasse, cum pro loco et tempore et personis multa fuerint dispensanda. By his opponents he was accused of covetousness and nepotism, in procuring preferments for his relatives. The latter, certainly not without good grounds, as may be gathered from the way in which his zealous friend Peter de Blois defends him (in ep. 38).

his post as chancellor, king Henry regarded it as an indication of his change of views on political and ecclesiastical interests, and was by this circumstance first prejudiced against him; and his previous inclination in his favor must have gone on continually changing into greater aversion, when he saw in the man in whom he had hoped to find a grateful and zealous servant, his most resolute adversary. One fact which proves what an injury great external privileges were to the true interests of the spiritual order is this; there were to be found amongst the clergy of England, men who, by the commission of the worst crimes, had fallen under the jurisdiction of the civil tribunals. The king demanded that such persons, after having been divested in the usual form of their spiritual character, should be given over to the common tribunals, and suffer the punishment appointed by the laws. He alleged in support of this, that the loss of the clerical dignity was to such people no punishment at all; that the more they dishonored by their crimes the clerical profession, the severer ought to be their punishment. By being suffered to go unpunished, such crimes spread with fearful rapidity.[1] Yet the archbishop, carried away by his hierarchical delusion, thought himself bound to insist that, even in these unworthy subjects, the clerical character and the jurisdiction of the church should be respected. In the year 1164, the king caused sixteen resolutions to be laid before an assembly composed of spiritual and lay orders, at Clarendon, which related to the securing of the civil power against the encroachments of the hierarchy. They were adopted, under oath, by all; and even Thomas Becket yielded to the prevailing spirit. But soon his hierarchical conscience loaded him with the severest reproaches. He put on the dress of a penitent; he proposed to resign his archbishopric, of which he had showed himself so unworthy; to withdraw into solitude and do penance, both on account of the transgressions of his earlier life at court, and on account of this last infidelity to the interests of the church. He drew up a report to the pope of what had transpired, and left the whole to be disposed of by his decision. The pope confirmed him in his resistance to those sixteen articles, and absolved him from the obligation of his unlawfully given oath; but encouraged him to continue the administration of the archbishopric for the good of the church. This was the signal for a fierce and wearisome contest between the archbishop and the king. Becket sought a refuge in France, where he spent nearly seven years in exile. From both sides, delegates were sent to the pope; Becket visited him in person. But the affair lingered along, since the king and his money had their influence also at the papal court;[2] since on

[1] Which the king says: Per hujusmodi castigationes talium clericorum imo verius coronatorum daemonum flagitia non reprimi, sed potius in dies regnum deterius fieri. Ad nocendum fore promptiores, nisi post poenam spiritualem corporali poenae subdantur. Et poenam parum curare de ordinis amissione, qui ordinis contemplatione a tam enormibus manus continere non verentur et tanto deteriores esse in scelere, quanto sunt caeteris ordinis privilegio digniores. Heribert. p. 33.

[2] Metuebat (Romanus pontifex), quod si ita omnino rex pateretur repulsam, majus in ecclesia schisma faceret, quod et ipsi, qui missi fuerant et praesertim laici minabantur. In favor of the king was a majority of the cardinals, quibus ut principibus et magnatibus placeant, studere mos est, aliis vero renitentibus. Heribert. p. 75.

the one hand, there was an unwillingness to make a victim of the bishop, who stood up so firmly and staked his all for the interest of the hierarchy; but on the other hand, too, there was great reason to fear lest, in the contest then going on with the emperor Frederic, the latter, and his pope, should procure an important ally in the king of England, if he should be driven to an extreme. At length, however, a treaty of peace seemed to have been brought about; and Becket, in 1170, returned back to England. But the reconciliation was but transitory; and as the archbishop pursued the same principles with inflexible consistency, the quarrel could not fail to break out anew. Becket was received by one party with enthusiastic admiration, by the other with abhorrence; since they looked upon him as nothing better than a traitor to his king and country. Four knights considered some remark which escaped the king in a moment of violent anger, as an invitation to revenge him on the archbishop, and the latter was murdered by them in the church. Yet, under these circumstances, his death could not but serve directly to procure the most brilliant victory for the cause for which he contended. He appeared to the people as a martyr for the cause of God; as a saint: crowds flocked to pray before his tomb; and soon divers stories got abroad about the wonderful cures performed there. Men of all ranks bore testimony to their truth. John of Salisbury, a man of spirit and intelligence, but we must add, too, the archbishop's enthusiastic friend as well as fellow-sufferer, having served him in the capacity of archdeacon and secretary, even he speaks of them with astonishment as an eye-witness; so that striking appearances, produced either by the ecstatic flights of a strong faith or by an excited fancy, must certainly have occurred there.[1] It was in vain that Becket's opponents sought to suppress this enthusiasm by outward force; it only burst forth with the more violence.[2] In these facts, men saw a testimony from God mightier than the decisions of the pope. Instead of Becket's needing any testimony from the pope, thought his party, these miracles wrought at his tomb were much rather a testimony for the cause of pope Alexander himself against his adversaries; for Becket had in truth been a zealous adherent of the latter. He must have been a schismatic, if it were not right to consider this person the lawful pope; and a schismatic, God would not honor by miracles.[3] King Henry was deeply

[1] Multa et magna miracula fiunt, catervatim confluentibus praelatis, ut videant in aliis et sentiant in se potentiam et clementiam ejus, qui semper in sanctis suis mirabilis et gloriosus est. Nam et in loco passionis ejus et ubi ante majus altare pernoctavit humandus et ubi tandem sepultus est, paralytici curantur, coeci vident, surdi audiunt, loquuntur muti, claudi ambulant, evadunt febricitantes, arrepti a daemonio liberantur et a variis morbis sanantur aegroti, blasphemi a daemonio arrepti confunduntur. — Quae profecto nulla ratione scribere praesumsissem, nisi me super his fides oculata certissimum reddidisset. Ep. 286.

[2] John of Salisbury says: Inhibuerunt nomine publicae potestatis, ne miracula, quae fiebant, quisquam publicare praesumeret. Caeterum frustra quis obnubilare desiderat, quod Deus clarificare disponit. Eo enim amplius percrebuere miracula, quo videbantur impiis studiosius occultanda.

[3] John of Salisbury, ep. 287. Dubitatur a plurimis, an pars domini papae, in qua stamus, de justitia niteretur, sed eam a crimine schismatis gloriosus martyr absolvit, qui si fautor esset schismatis nequaquam tantis miraculis coruscaret. He thinks he should have been very much surprised that the pope did not at once pronounce Thomas

affected when he heard of Becket's death. He did penance, because his words, though without intention on his part, had given occasion for such a deed. He made every effort to justify himself before the pope and procure his absolution. He acquiesced in all the conditions prescribed, and yielded more than Thomas Becket had ever been able to gain during his lifetime. The king himself made a pilgrimage to his tomb, and there submitted to exercises of penance.

Through the yielding of the emperor Frederic, to which he had been moved by the force of circumstances and by considerations of prudence, nothing in the relation of the two parties, — of which one defended a papal absolutism, requiring entire subjection of the states and churches; the other, the rights of independent state authority, — nothing of all this had been changed. The principles which had come under discussion in the controversies about investiture, which had been placed in a still clearer light and more widely diffused through the influence of Arnold of Brescia, and to the promotion of which the study of the Roman law begun with so much zeal, at the university of Bologna, had contributed, — these principles we find expressed in the acts and public declarations of the Hohenstaufen emperors. Gottfried of Viterbo, who was secretary and chaplain to the emperors Conrad the Third, Frederic the First, and Henry the Sixth, and had opportunities enough to hear what was said at the imperial court, — this writer, in speaking of the controversy between the imperial and the papal parties, in his Chronicle, or Pantheon,[1] quotes these declarations from the lips of the former. The emperor Constantine, to whose donation to the Roman bishop Silvester, men were in the habit of appealing, had by no means conceded to the popes an authority of lordship in Italy; but chosen them, as priests of the Supreme God, for his spiritual fathers, and sought blessing and intercession at their hands. Had he actually conceded to the pope a right of sovereignty over Italy, he could not have left the Western empire, of which Italy was a part, to one of his sons; and so, too, Rome went along with the Western empire to the succeeding emperors. As he affirms, men appealed to the words of Christ: "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's;" to the fact that Christ paid the tribute-money for himself and for Peter; to the declaration of St. Paul concerning the respect due to those in authority; and yet, they added, this declaration had immediate reference to a Nero. We here listen to well-known voices, which we already heard speaking in the controversies which preceded, and which are again reëchoed in the letters of Frederic the Second.

Nor had the emperor Frederic the First, by any means given up the plan which he had hitherto followed in the contest with the pope, but was making new preparations to prosecute it. He had been at work

Becket a saint, unless he had remembered what was done in the Roman senate on the report of Pilate, ne deitas Christi, cujus nomen erat Judaeis et gentibus praedicandum, terrenae potestati videretur obnoxia et emendicatam dicerent infideles. — Sic ergo nutu divino arbitror evenisse, ut martyris hujus gloria nec decreto pontificis nec edicto principis attollatur, sed Christo praecipue auctore invalescat.

[1] P. 16. Muratori scriptores rerum Italicarum, t. vii, f. 360.

to establish anew his authority in Italy. He sought, by uniting the kingdom of the Sicilies with the imperial crown, to oppose a twofold power against the popes, in their own vicinity. This was accomplished by his son Henry the Sixth, who was animated by the same spirit with his father. The most difficult and unequal contest seemed to stand before the papal power; on one side, the emperor Henry the Sixth, in the vigor of manhood, and at the summit of his power; on the other, the feeble old man Celestin the Third, now past his eightieth year. But, by circumstances not entering into the calculations of human wisdom, in which oftentimes the sudden turn of important events compels us to recognize the guidance of an invisible hand, a change was suddenly brought about of an altogether opposite kind. The emperor Henry died in the year 1197: in the following year, died the pope; and his successor was the cardinal Lothario, of Anagni, one of the most distinguished men who were ever invested with the papal dignity, and now not over forty years old.[1] Innocent the Third united in himself the three parts which Alexander the Third had required as necessary to the right administration of the papal office; zeal in preaching, ability in church-governance, and skill in the management of penance.[2] He was, so far as the power of a correct judgment was possible at *his own* point of view, well acquainted with the relations and wants of the church in his time, and had been educated according to the system of theology taught in the universities of that period, for he had studied at the university of Paris, a fact of which he speaks with particular pleasure and gratitude.[3] He was entirely filled with the idea of the papal monarchy over the world, and contrived to make use of the conjunction of many favorable circumstances with skill and energy for the realization of that idea. His activity extended over a field of enormous extent,[4] — it reached to every quarter of the world. His watchful eye observed everything that transpired in churches and states. By his legates, he would make his presence everywhere felt, and enforce obedience.[5] Over bishops and monarchs, in affairs eccle-

[1] Hence the remark of the German poet Walter von der Vogelweide: "O we der babst ist ze junc, hilf Herre diner Kristenheit." P. 9, in Lachmann's Ausgabe, v. 35.

[2] When some person had said to Alexander the Third: Domine, bonus papa es, quidquid facis papale est; he replied: Si scirem bien i (n) viar e bien predicar e penitense donar, io seroie boene pape. See Petri Cantoris verbum abbreviatum pag. 171.

[3] In a letter to the king of France: Tibi et regno tuo specialiter nos fatemur teneri, in quo nos recolimus in studiis literarum aetatem transegisse minorem ac divino munere quantaecunque scientiae donum adeptos, beneficiorum impensam multiplicem suscepisse. See epp. lib. i, ep. 171.

[4] In a letter in which, impressed with a sense of the difficulties and the responsibleness of his office, he implores an interest in the prayers of the abbots of the Cistercian chapter, he notices the many kinds of business devolving on him, yet doubtless without naming them all, as follows: Nunc ambigua quaestionum elucidans et certo in ambiguis usus responso, nunc difficiles nodos causarum justae diffinitionis manu dissolvens, nunc malignorum incursus refraenans, nunc humilibus clypeum apostolicae protectionis indulgens. Lib. i, ep. 358.

[5] His words: "If the omnipresent God still makes angels his ministers, how should the pope, who is a limited man, be able to extend his activity to all countries in any other way than by legates?" Si ergo nos, quos humana conditio simul in diversis locis corporaliter esse non patitur, hujusmodi naturae defectum per angelos nostros redimere nequiverimus, quomodo judicium et justitiam et alia, quae ad summi pontificis officium pertinent, in gentibus longe positis faciemus? Lib. xvi, ep. 12.

siastical and political, which latter he believed he could bring before his tribunal, in so far as they should be decided on religious or moral principles, he asserted his supreme juridical authority with energy and firmness.[1] His numerous letters, the records of his active guidance of the church, certainly evince that he was animated, not solely by a zeal for the maintenance of the papal authority and dominion, but also by a zeal for the true well-being of the church. But devoted to that system of a spiritual monarchy over the world, in which secular and spiritual matters were already so confounded together, as a system founded in divine right; and feeling himself bound to defend this system as well against reactions proceeding from a good, as those proceeding from a bad spirit, he was betrayed by his bad cause into the use of bad means.

A proof of this is the history of his controversies with England. King John, with whom he there had to contend, was a man utterly destitute of moral worth, accustomed to follow all his lusts and passions without restraint, and to yield himself to every caprice. Fear alone could restrain him. Even to the religious impressions, which had so much power in his times, his inherent sensual barbarity was unsusceptible. He wavered betwixt a brutal infidelity and a servile superstition. A dispute concerning the filling up of a vacancy left by the archbishop of Canterbury, gave the pope opportunity to guide the choice after his own will, and he fixed upon an Englishman, cardinal Stephen Langton, to occupy this post. The king thought he might complain that his wishes had not been duly consulted in this affair, and perhaps too he was averse to the man, who may have been one of the worthier sort. At first, he repelled with blind defiance all the representations and threats of the pope. The interdict under which England was laid in 1208, could not break down his stubborn self-will, great as was the terror which elsewhere such a measure at that time spread all around; for the entire people, innocent and guilty, must suffer, because the king would not obey the pontiff; all must be deprived of the blessing of the church. Of the sacraments, none but extreme unction, the baptism of children, and confession were permitted. The bodies of the dead were borne forth and buried without prayer or the attendance of priests.

There was one individual, however, who encouraged the king to despise the interdict which filled so many minds with uneasiness. The man who possessed this influence with the king, a theologian named Alexander, had not adopted this policy through any interest for the truth, but solely induced by the most sordid motives of gain. He courted the king's favor to promote his own advantage, acting as the tool of his despotism in the contest with papal absolutism. "This calamity," said he to the poor, miserable monarch, "had not come upon England by the king's fault, but on account of the vices of his subjects." The king himself was the scourge of the Lord, and ordained

[1] Ep. lib. i, ep. 324. Decision on the right of property in a lot of land. Lib. i, ep. 249, that his legate should force the kings of Portugal and Castile, by ban and interdict, to remain faithful to the league they had sworn to each other.

of God to rule the people with a rod of iron. As often happens, the same was said here to uphold the interest of political despotism, as had been said by others to defend the interests of truth and piety; that over the possessions of princes and potentates, and over civil governments, the pope had no jurisdiction whatever; for, to the first of the apostles, to Peter, was committed by our Lord, only a purely spiritual authority. This worthless individual was overloaded by the king with benefices; but he afterwards experienced the just reward of his baseness; for the very king whom he had served, afterwards gave him up to the pope; and, stripped of all his prebends, he saw himself reduced to the condition of a beggar.[1]

The circumstance which at last, after a resistance of five years, bowed the stubborn will of the king to submission, was not the might of the spiritual weapons of the pope, but fear of a foreign power which the pope managed to raise up against him, under the form of a crusade. King Philip Augustus, of France, welcomed the opportunity which gave him a chance in executing on king John the papal sentence of deposition, of making himself master of the English crown. As the latter had the more occasion to dread such a war, because he had exasperated his subjects and excited discontent amongst his nobles; so, in the year 1213, he humbled his tone from that of insolent defiance to an equally slavish submission. He acknowledged the pope as his liege lord, received the crown from his hands, swore subjection to him like a vassal, and bound himself to assist in a crusade which Innocent was then laboring with great zeal to set on foot. The pope now became his protector and adopted him as a penitent prodigal. When the nobles of England, dissatisfied with the self-degradation of their king, and with his many arbitrary acts, sought to revive the old liberties of the realm, and to oppose a firm check to despotism, it was the pope who now turned his spiritual arms to fight the battles of such a king. But if the popes, when they appeared as defenders of justice and of sacred institutions and customs, as protectors of oppressed innocence, could not fail thereby to present the pontifical dignity in a more advantageous light to the nations, a proceeding of this sort, where it was so plainly evinced that they were ready to sacrifice everything else to their personal aggrandizement, could only produce an impression injurious to their reputation on the public conscience. In England, it was already murmured: "Thou, who, as holy father, as the pattern of piety and the protector of justice and truth, oughtest to let thy light shine before the whole world, dost thou enter into concord with such a wretch, — praise and protect such a monster? But thou defendest the tyrant, who cringes before thee, that thou mayst draw everything into the whirlpool of Roman cupidity; yet such a motive directly charges thee as guilty before God."[2] The

[1] See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1209, f. 192.

[2] The free-spirited English historian, Matthew of Paris, quotes such words (f. 224) from the lips of the English barons. It certainly appears, comparing it with other expressions of his, that he cannot seriously mean what he himself says against this: Et sic barones lacrimantes et lamentantes regem et papam maledixerunt, imprecantes

city of London despised the ban and the interdict, whereby the pope sought to compel obedience to the king. The papal bull was declared null; for such things did not depend on the pope's decision; since the authority bestowed on the apostle Peter, by our Lord, related solely to the church. "Why does the insatiable avarice of Rome," it was said, "stretch itself out to us? What concern have the apostolical bishops with our domestic quarrels? They want to be successors of Constantine, not of Peter. If they do not follow Peter in his works, they cannot partake of his authority; for God treats men according to their true deserts. Shameful! to see these miserable usurers and promoters of simony aiming already, by means of their ban, to rule over the whole world. How very different from Peter, the men who claim to possess his authority!"[1] And, in despite of the interdict, public worship still continued to be kept up in London.

The present relations of the papal dominion to the German empire were also favorable to it. The young prince Frederic the Second, a child only a few years old, left behind him by the emperor Henry the Sixth, had been recommended by his mother Constantia, on her deathbed, to the guardianship of the pope. Frederic, it is true, was already elected king of Rome, but there appeared to be no possibility of making his claims valid. His uncle, Philip, duke of Suabia, and the duke Otho, of Saxony, were contending with one another for the imperial dignity, and this furnished the pope with another welcome opportunity of placing the papal power high above every other subsisting among men; to appropriate to himself the supreme direction of all human affairs, the right of deciding as to the disposition of the contested imperial crown. Innocent, to prepare the way for the decision of this dispute, drew up a writing,[2] in which, making use of various passages of Scripture, particularly from the Old Testament, he brings together, in the usual scholastic form of that time, the arguments for and against the choice of all three, — Frederic, Philip, and Otho. Against Philip he objected, that he was descended of a race hostile to the church; that the sins of the fathers would be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations, if they followed their father's example. In favor of Otho it was alleged, on the other hand, that he had sprung from a race constantly devoted to the church; and the pope concluded, after examining all the arguments on both sides, that, if the German princes, when he had waited a sufficient length of time, could not unite in the choice of any one, he should give his voice for Otho. When, in pursuance of this resolution, he, in the year 1201, caused duke Otho to be recognized by his legates as king of Rome, and pronounced excommunication on all his opponents, he met with determined resistance from Philip's party, which constituted

inexpiabiliter, cum scriptum sit: principi non maledices, et pietatem et reverentiam transgredientur, cum illustrem Joannem regem Angliae servum asseruerunt, cum Deo servire regnare sit.

[1] Matthew of Paris, who cites such voices, adds, to be sure, what hardly could be his honest opinion: Sic igitur blasphemantes, ponentes os in coelum ad interdicti vel excommunicationis sententiam nullum penitus habentes respectum, per totam civitatem celebrarunt divina signa, pulsantes et vocibus altisonis modulantes.

[2] Registr. ed. Baluz. i, f. 697.

the majority. A portion of it, including several bishops, issued a letter to the pope,[1] in which they very strongly expressed their surprise at the conduct of his legate. "Where had it ever occurred in the case of any of his predecessors, that they so interfered in the election of an emperor as to represent themselves either as electors, or as umpires over the election? Originally, no papal election could be valid without the concurrence of the emperor; but the magnanimity of the emperors had led them to renounce this right. If, now, the simplicity of laymen had given up, from a feeling of reverence to the church, a right previously exercised by them, how should the sacredness of the papacy presume to usurp to itself a right which it never possessed?" Innocent replied to this protestation, in a letter to the duke of Zähringen: "Far was it from him," he wrote, "to take away from the princes the right of election, which belonged to them by ancient custom, especially since it was by the apostolical see itself, which had transferred this right from the Greeks to the Germans, that the same had been given them. But the princes should also understand that to the pope belonged the right of trying the person elected king and of promoting him to the empire, since it is the pope who has to anoint, to consecrate, and to crown him. Suppose then, even by a unanimous vote of the princes, the choice should fall on an excommunicated person, on a tyrant, on a madman, or on a heretic, or heathen,—is the pope to be forced to anoint, consecrate, and crown such a person?" After the assassination of duke Philip, in the year 1208, no power remained to oppose king Otho; and he continued to maintain a good understanding with the pope, till he obtained from him the imperial crown. But as he defended, against him, the rights of the empire, so he soon fell into a quarrel with him; which was finally carried to such a length, that the pope pronounced the ban upon him. And now his choice fell on the prince whom he had at first endeavored to place at the farthest distance from the imperial throne, the young prince, Frederic the Second. It was not till the pope had examined the choice of the princes at the Lateran council, in 1215, that he ratified it.

The emperor Frederic might well adopt, from the first, the spirit which animated his ancestry in their contest with the popes; nor were the teachings of his own experience, from his earliest childhood,[2] calculated to inspire him with much love for them. Still, his natural prudence forbade him, in the outset, to let his designs be known publicly. As the getting up of a new crusade was a favorite thought of Innocent's successor, Honorius the Third, which lay nearer to his heart than the interest of the papal hierarchy, so Frederic could take advantage of this humor of the pope, and, by falling in with it, carry out many objects of his own, which under other circumstances would not have been possible. He amused the pope, however, by putting off, from one time to another, the fulfilment of his promise to undertake a

[1] L. c. f. 715.

[2] Frederic complains, l. 1, ep. 20, de Vineis, of the bad treatment he had already received from pope Innocent the Third, to whose guardianship he had been committed by his dying mother.

crusade. When the last term had arrived, in which Frederic had bound himself, under penalty of the ban, actually to engage in his crusade, Honorius died. This was in the year 1227. His successor, Gregory the Ninth, though now seventy-seven years old, was still full of energy, and as the papal hierarchy was with him a more important object than the cause of the crusades, the emperor found it more difficult to satisfy him. Frederic seemed disposed really to fulfil the promise given two years before. A great army assembled near Brindisi, for the purpose of passing by sea to the East. The emperor had already embarked; when compelled, as he said, by illness, he turned back, and the whole expedition was broken up. The pope looked upon this as a mere pretext; and at the annual Roman Synod of Easter, he pronounced the ban on the emperor, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance. In a letter to the king of England,[1] the emperor complained of the wrong done him by the pope; he solemnly avowed his innocence, and declared it to be his determination to fulfil his vow as soon as it was possible. He sought to show, that cupidity and ambition lay at the bottom of all the machinations of the Roman court.[2] "The primitive church, founded in poverty and simplicity, had been fruitful of holy men; but through superabundence of earthly goods she had become corrupted." He drew a picture of the extortions, which, to the great injury of Christendom, proceeded from Rome; he pointed to the history of England in the times of Innocent the Third, as a warning against papal ambition, which sought to make all empires dependent on itself; and he called upon the princes to take a lesson from his own example, and, according to the ancient proverb, "Look out for themselves, when their neighbor's house was on fire."[3]

Still the emperor, doubtless, understood that he should always have the public voice against him, till he had refuted, by his own action, the reproachful charges of the pope.[4] In the year 1228, he undertook an expedition to Palestine. This, however, would, in the eyes of the pope, only make the matter worse; for it appeared an unheard-of contempt of the authority of the church, that Frederic should venture so to despise the ban pronounced on him as to put himself at the head of so holy an enterprise. He issued the command to Palestine, that no one should obey the emperor, since he was an excommunicated person. He sought to stir up enemies against him on all sides, and his states were threatened. The emperor managed to render all these attempts abortive. He hit upon the expedient of issuing his orders to the army, not in his own name, but in the name of God and of Christendom. Through favorable political circumstances, he suc-

[1] Matthew of Paris, at the year 1228, fol. 293.

[2] Curia Romana omnium malorum radix et origo, non maternos, sed actus exercens novercales, ex cognitis fructibus suis certum faciens argumentum.

[3] In the words of Virgil: Tunc tua res agitur, paries quum proximus ardet.

[4] It was the emperor's true mode of thinking which he expressed, when he declared among the Mohammedans, that he had undertaken this expedition, and was obliged to acquire something by means of it, in order to restore his good fame in the West. See extraits des historiens arabes relatifs aux guerres des Croisades, par M. Reinauld, 1829, pag. 429

ceeded in concluding a peace of ten years with the Sultan of Egypt; whereby, to be sure, the wishes of those who felt a deeper interest than the emperor for the cause of Christianity in the East, were by no means satisfied. At the holy sepulchre, he placed upon his head the crown of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and in his letters written to Europe, boasted, with a tone of triumph, of the great things he had been able to accomplish in so short a time. "The finger of God," he declared, "was manifestly in it." Then, in the year 1229, he hastened back to Europe, to the relief of his hardly-pressed states. Here he found very many enemies to contend with; and the pope endeavored to get up a general crusade against him. The emperor easily got the victory; yet he understood too well the spirit of his age, to be disposed to push things to an extreme. He concluded, in 1230, a treaty with the pope, which was to the latter's advantage. He promised to obey the commands of the church, on all the points with reference to which he had been excommunicated. Yet, as both remained true to their principles, this peace could not be of very long duration; and though they were apparently united, yet in secret they worked in opposition to each other. When Frederic sought to subject the cities of Lombardy, to extend and confirm his power in Italy, but refused to accept the offered mediation of the pope, which would go against his interests, the latter became still more alienated from him. He united himself with the liberty-loving cities of Lombardy, which the emperor had exasperated by his despotic conduct; and, in the year 1239, he pronounced the ban on him anew, because he had stripped the church of many of her possessions, and because of the oppressive measures with which he had burdened her. At the same time, he threw in an accusation, which, in this age, must have made a greater impression than all the rest, that, "on account of his words and deeds, which were known through the whole world, he was strongly suspected of not thinking rightly about the Catholic faith." The emperor thereupon issued a circular letter to the Christian princes and cardinals, in which he was careful to distinguish the pope from the Roman church and the papal see. While he testified his reverence for the apostolical see, he declared Gregory only to be unworthy of his office. He could not recognize, as his judge, a man who, from the first, had shown himself to be his bitterest enemy. The moving spring of his actions was nothing but a selfishness, which could not forgive the emperor for being unwilling to leave in his (the pope's) hands the management of Italian affairs. He appealed to the decision of a general council. To wipe away the impression which this declaration might create, the pope now came forth more openly with the charge, which before he had but hinted at. He issued a bull, in which he portrayed the emperor in the blackest colors as an infidel. He accused him of having asserted that the whole world had been deceived by three impostors,—Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed; that men should believe nothing but that which could be made out on rational grounds, and explained from the forces of nature. It was impossible to believe that God was born of a virgin.

The question here arises, whether these complaints against the religious opinions of the emperor Frederic rest on any basis of truth. Assuredly, the testimony of the pope against him cannot be received as trustworthy. Respecting a prince, who contended so powerfully against the hierarchy, and thus became involved in contentions with the monks, who served as its instruments; a prince who rose above many of the prejudices of his times, and who lived on very free terms with the Saracens, it was easy to set afloat disreputable stories of this sort. A pope so passionately prejudiced against the emperor was, doubtless, inclined to believe everything bad of him; and as the emperor called him the protector of the heretics in Milan, so he would be glad of an opportunity to retort the accusation more severely in another form. Even the historian Matthew of Paris notices the contradictions in which men involved themselves by these charges against the emperor. Sometimes he was accused of having declared all the three founders of religion to be imposters; sometimes of having placed Mohammed above Christ. We might conceive that Frederic was led by his contest with the hierarchy, and by the clearer discernment of his less prejudiced understanding, to detect the falsifications of original Christianity, and the corruption of the church which sprung from the mixing up of spiritual and secular things. Judging from the public imperial declarations compiled by the chancellor Peter de Vineis, it might appear, we admit, that Frederic the Second aimed at a purification of the church on this particular side; as, in a circular letter to the princes, appealing to the testimony of his conscience, and to God, he declares: "It had ever been his purpose to bring back all the clergy, and especially the higher order, to the standard of the apostolical church, when they led an apostolical life, and imitated the humility of our Lord. For such clergymen are used to behold the vision of angels, to shine by miracles, to heal the sick, to raise the dead, and to subject princes to themselves, not by arms, but by the power of a holy life." "But the clergy at present," he then adds, "devoted to the world and to drunkenness, are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. In their case, religion is choked by the superfluity of riches. To deprive them of those hurtful riches, with which they are damnably burdened, is a work of charity. He would invite all the princes to coöperate with him in this work, in order that the clergy, relieved of all their superfluities, may serve God, contented with a little."[1] The emperor here expresses a conviction, which we find expressed in many a reaction of the Christian spirit against the secularization of the church, since the time of Arnold of Brescia; in the prophecies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; in the songs of the German national poets, and in the phenomena of the history of sects. But the public declarations of a monarch can hardly be taken as trustworthy sources from which to form a judgment of his religious opinions; and the rest of the emperor's conduct by no means evinces that he was governed by any such plan of impoverishing the clergy

[1] Ep. 2.

He appears in his laws to have been a violent persecutor of the sects to the advantage of the hierarchy, although in many of them he must have observed a like religious interest directed against the secularization of the church.

As to the remarks ascribed to Frederic the Second, by which he is alleged to have placed the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions on one and the same level, such remarks[1] may, perhaps, have only been a current form among the people for expressing a naturalistic mode of thinking. But although expressions, — actually made by no one, — but which had become stamped as the current phrase, to denote a deistic, naturalistic mode of thinking, may have been wrongfully attributed to the emperor Frederic, — yet it may be true, after all, that, from other indications, men had reason to conclude that he was really given to such a mode of thinking. Several other remarks, said to have been uttered by him, and supposed to indicate a decided infidelity, were circulated about; as, for example, that once, on seeing the host carried by, he observed, "How long shall this imposture go on?"[2] It is remarkable that, among the Mohammedans, the emperor left the impression, during his stay in the East, that he was anything but a believing Christian.[3] It may be easily explained how, — by his passionate contests with the popes, from whom he had experienced, ever since his earliest childhood, in the name of religion and the church, so much evil; by his opposition to the acknowledged corruption of the church; by the incongruities between the reigning church doctrine and his clear understanding, Frederic might be impelled to reject the whole at once, destitute as he was of the religious sense which would have enabled him to separate and distinguish the original faith and the foreign elements with which it had become encumbered. The influence of the learned Mohammedans, with whom he was on terms of intimacy, might also have contributed to promote such a tendency in him. We cannot be surprised that Frederic's one-sided intellectual training, in which sincerity and warmth of religious feeling had no part, should have led *him* to an infidelity, which was

[1] See further on, in the history of the scholastic theology.

[2] See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1439, f. 408; and something more definite by the contemporary Alberic, as Leibnitz (Access. Hist. t. ii, 568) relates. The emperor's words, as the pyx was being carried by to a sick person, were: "Heu me! quamdiu durabit truffa ista?"

[3] Abulfeda repeats, from the mouth of a Mohammedan scholar, Gemel-ed-din, who stood high in the estimation of Frederic's sons, an account of Frederic's inclination in favor of the followers of Islam, which descended from him to his sons; with which, to be sure, the false story is joined, that, for this reason, Frederic was excommunicated by the pope, tom. v, pp. 145–46. When the words of the Koran against Christianity were proclaimed from the minaret of Omar's mosque in Jerusalem, the cadi, with whom the emperor resided was greatly annoyed. He contrived to have it stopped, lest the emperor might be offended. The latter, surprised at no longer hearing the accustomed cry from the minaret, asked the cadi the reason of it; and the cadi explained the whole matter. "You have done wrong," said the emperor, — "why should you, on my account, be wanting to your duty, to your law, to your religion?" See the book of Reinauld, already referred to, p. 432. An official, attached to the mosque of Omar, who conducted him about, related that the emperor's conversation showed sufficiently that he believed nothing about Christianity; when he spoke of it, it was only to ridicule it. L. c. p. 431.

called forth, in occasional paroxysms, at least, by mere brutal rudeness, in the case of king John of England. We might indeed say, with the historian Matthew of Paris, that the religious opinions of this emperor, concerning which we can judge but from what others report, are certainly known only to the Omniscient:[1] but if we compare all the accounts diffused among Christians and Mohammedans, we must still be inclined to consider him as having been, to say the least, a denier of revealed religion. The circumstance that the pope did not make any further use of these criminations, by no means makes it clear that they were all a fabrication; for naturally, it would have been found difficult, if not impossible, to establish these charges on such grounds of evidence as were required, in order to bring a process against him.

A conflict arose between Gregory the Ninth and the emperor Frederic, for life or for death; the old Gregory brought secular and spiritual weapons to bear against the emperor; he allied himself with the cities of Lombardy, which were battling for their freedom, and from all quarters sought to collect money to defray the expenses of the war, whence various complaints about the corruption of the Roman court, and many a free speech in opposition to it, would naturally be provoked.[2] The emperor cleared himself publicly from the aspersions thrown upon him by the pope, by a full profession of orthodoxy; he contrived to prevent the introduction, into his states, of papal bulls, which were adverse to his interests; and carried his point, in forbidding the pope's interdict to be observed. Even at Pisa, mass was celebrated in his presence. The monks and clergy, who consented to be used as the pope's instruments, and refused to hold public worship, were removed from his states. His weapons also were successful. In the year 1239, his troops stood victorious before the gates of Rome. The pope meanwhile sent letters missive for a general council, to meet in 1241, and proposed to the emperor a suspension of arms, in order that the meeting might be held. Frederic, it is true, was inclined to peace; but he well understood the hostile intentions of the pope, who only wanted to use the council as an instrument against him; and he would not be hindered by it in prosecuting his designs against the Lombardian states. He therefore accepted the proposal of a cessation of hostilities, but on the condition that the Lombardian states, the allies of the pope, should have no share in it, and that no council should be assembled. The pope would not listen to this; nor yet would he suffer himself to be prevented from holding a council. He contrived so to arrange it, that a Genoese fleet should be at hand for the protection of the prelates who might attend the council. In vain were all the warnings giving out by the emperor.

[1] Matthew of Paris says, concerning Frederic's accusers on the point of his orthodoxy: Si peccabant, vel non, novit ipse, qui nihil ignorat. L. c. f. 527.

[2] Matthew of Paris says: Adeo invaluit Romanae ecclesiae insatiabilis cupiditas, confundens fas nefasque, quod deposito rubore velut meretrix vulgaris et effrons omnibus venalis et exposita, usuram pro parvo simoniam pro nullo inconvenienti reputavit. L. c. f. 493.

The Genoese fleet, however, was beaten by that of the emperor, and many prelates fell into his hands as prisoners. Yet the pope, advanced as he was in years, did not suffer himself to be moved by this untoward event. He required of the emperor, to the last, unqualified submission. Frederic now saw his predictions verified, and he took no pains to conceal his joy at having penetrated into the pope's designs. He also shut his eyes to all forbearance towards the pope. In his proclamations, he dwelt on the contrast between such a pope and the apostle Peter, of whom he pretended to be the vicegerent. "When the pope is in drink," said he, "he fancies himself able to control the emperor and all the kingdoms of the world."[1] The aged pope died, while thus hardly pressed, in the year 1241.

After the sudden demise of Celestin the Fourth, who was chosen next, followed a two years' vacancy of the papal chair; and the cardinals, by the tardiness of the election, which many ascribed to their worldly views, to the ambition and the thirst for power of individuals, drew upon themselves violent reproaches.[2] Compelled by the emperor to hasten the election, they finally made choice of cardinal Sinibald of Anagni, Innocent the Fourth. The new government opened with peaceful prospects; for a treaty was set on foot between the emperor and the pope, and such an one as would redound to the advantage of the latter. But when the two principal parties came to meet for the purpose of ratifying it, they showed a mutual distrust in each other's proceedings, and the affair was spun out in length. Meantime, Innocent, who had no intention to deal honestly with the emperor, escaped by flight from a situation in which, besieged by the weapons of Frederic, he could not act freely. According to a preconcerted plan, he was conveyed by a Genoese fleet to Lyons. There he placed the emperor once more under the ban. Next, he sent letters missive for a general council to meet at Lyons in the year 1245, where, also, Frederic was cited to appear and defend himself.[3] The pope presented before this council many and violent charges against the emperor;

[1] Ep. 1. Tu ad hoc vivis ut concedas, in cujus vasis et scyphis aureis scriptum est: bibo, bibis. Cujus verbi praeteritum sic frequenter in mensa repetis et post cibum, quod quasi raptus usque ad tertium coelum, Hebraice et Graece loqueris et Latine.

[2] So the emperor writes to them (ep. 14): Sedentes ut colubri non quae sursum sunt, sapitis; sed quae ante oculos sita sunt, mundana, non spiritualia intuentibus providetis. Sitit enim quaelibet praesulatum et papalem esurit apicem. And in a letter of the king of France (ep. 35): Ecce nobilis urbs Romana sine capite vivit, quae caput est aliarum. Quare? Certe propter discordiam Romanorum; sed quid eos ad discordiam provocavit? Auri cupiditas et ambitio dignitatum. He reproaches them on account of their fear of the emperor.

[3] A remarkable sign of the freer public sentiment, on which already the word of popes, so manifestly governed by worldly passions and worldly interests, no longer had its former power, is the anecdote told by Matthew of Paris: A priest in Paris was obliged, in conformity with a command addressed to all, to publish the ban which had been pronounced against Frederic. In doing this, he declared that he had received it in charge to announce the ban with tapers burning and the ringing of the bells. He knew of the violent contention, and the inextinguishable hatred between them both; but as to the cause of it he knew nothing. He was aware, too, that one of the two was to blame and wronged the other; but which one it was, he did not know. But he pronounced the ban on that one, whichever it was, who wronged the other, and he pronounced those free who suffered the wrong which was so injurious to entire Christendom. See Matth. of Paris, f. 575.

and among these were charges of heresy, and of suspicious connections with the Saracens. The imperial statesman, Thaddeus de Suessa, who attended the council as Frederic's envoy, the only individual who stood forth in his defence, replied to these charges with a satirical allusion to the Roman court. One thing, at least, spoke in the emperor's favor, said he; in *his* states, he tolerated no usurer.[1] He at the same time declared, however, that to the most serious charge, that of heresy, the emperor himself alone must answer in person; and he therefore solicited a longer delay for him. With difficulty, the pope was prevailed upon to grant a respite of two weeks. But Frederic declined appearing before a council, got up by a pope in open hostility to him, as a thing beneath his own dignity and that of the empire. The pope now proceeded in the most solemn manner to pronounce the ban and the sentence of deposition on the emperor. Thaddeus himself was struck with awe and dismay; on the emperor alone it failed of making the least impression. On hearing of what had been done, he sent for the imperial crown, and placing it on his head, said: "I still possess this crown; and without a bloody struggle I shall not let it be plucked away from me by the attack of any pope or council." He drew up a circular letter, addressed to all the princes, in which he expressed himself in much too strong and free a manner[2] for the spirit of the times, against the proceedings of the pope.[3] "Would that we had learned a lesson," said he, "from the example of the monarchs before us, instead of finding ourselves compelled to serve, by what we must suffer, as examples for those who come after us! The sons of our own subjects forget the condition of their fathers, and honor neither king nor emperor the moment they are consecrated as apostolical fathers. What have not all the princes to fear from this prince of the priests, if one of them takes such liberties with the emperor! The princes have none to blame but themselves; they have brought the mischief on their own heads by their submissive obedience to these pretended saints, whose ambition is large enough to swallow up the whole world." "O, if your simple credulity would only beware of this leaven of the scribes and pharisees, which, according to the words of our Saviour, is hypocrisy, how many scandals of that Roman court you would learn to execrate, which are so infamous that decency forbids us to name them."[4] The numberless sources of revenue, by which they would enrich themselves at the expense of many an impoverished state, made them crazy, as the princes themselves must be well aware. He called upon them to unite with him

[1] Matthew of Paris, f. 585.

[2] Matthew of Paris says, concerning the impression which this letter made: Fridericus libertatem ac nobilitatem ecclesiae, quam ipse nunquam auxit, sed magnifici antecessores ejus malo grato suo stabilierunt, toto conamine studuit annullare et de haeresi per id ipsum se reddens suspectum, merito omnem, quem hactenus in omni populo igniculum famae propriae prudentiae et sapientiae habuit, impudenter et imprudenter exstinxit atque delevit.

[3] Ep. 2.

[4] O si vestrae credulitatis simplicitas a scribarum et pharisaeorum fermento, quod est hypocrisis, juxta sententiam salvatoris sibi curaret attendere, quot illius curiae turpitudines execrari posset is, quas honestas et pudor prohibet nos effari.

in wresting from the clergy this abundance of earthly goods, which was only a source of corruption to them and to the church.

The fierce contest began anew; and in vain did the emperor at length, moved by an unfortunate turn of civil affairs, offer his hand for peace. Innocent continued implacably to carry on the war till the death of the emperor, in 1250; and the popes never ceased to persecute the descendants of the house of Hohenstaufen. Thus the papal power came forth victorious, as to outward success, from these last violent contests; but this very victory was destined to prove its ruin. The power which could not be overthrown by outward force, must, as Bernard had foretold, prepare the way for its own destruction, by being abused. This very age furnished an example to show how a man, with no other weapons than those of piety and truth, might venture with impunity to resist the abuse of *that* power which could humble mighty monarchs.

This man was Robert Grosshead (Capito), bishop of Lincoln; a man who held also an important place among the learned theologians of his age. He was induced, by reason of a dispute with the worldly-minded canonicals of his cathedral, to make a journey to the Roman court, and thus he had an opportunity of learning, by personal observation, the whole extent of the corruption which prevailed at, and proceeded from, that court. In the year 1250, he delivered before the papal court, at Lyons, a strikingly bold discourse, in which he portrayed at large the faults of the church, and pointed out how far they were chargeable to the Roman court.[1] "The bad shepherds," he says here, "are the cause of the infidelity, schisms, false doctrines, and bad conduct throughout the whole world.[2] As the great work of Christ, for which he came into the world, was the salvation of souls, and the great work of Satan is their destruction; so the shepherds, who as shepherds take the place of Jesus Christ, if they preach not the word of God, — even though they should not lead vicious lives, — are anti-Christ, and Satan, clothing himself as an angel of light." He then goes on to describe the additional evil of a bad life in the clergy. "And the guilt of the whole," says he, "lies at the door of the Roman court, not simply because it does not root out this evil, — when it alone is both able and bound to do so, — but still more, because itself, by its dispensations, provisions, and collations appoints such shepherds; and thus, in order to provide for the temporal life of an individual, expose to eternal death thousands of souls, for the salvation of every one of whom Christ died. To be sure, the pope, being the vicegerent of Christ, must be obeyed. But when a pope allows himself to be moved by motives of consanguinity, or any other secular interest, to do anything contrary to the precepts and will of Christ, then he who obeys him, manifestly separates himself from Christ and

[1] This discourse, with other writings of Robert, is to be found in the Appendix to the Fasciculus rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque, by Ortuinus Gratius, ed. Brown, in the App. fol. 251.

[2] Mali pastores causa infidelitatis, schismatis, haereticae pravitatis et vitiosae conversationis per orbem universum.

his body, the church, and from him who fills the apostolical chair, as the representative of Christ. *But, whenever a universal obedience is paid him in such things, then comes the true and complete apostasy — the time of anti-Christ.*" He unconsciously predicts the Reformation, when he says: "*God forbid, that this chair should at some future day, when true Christians refuse to obey it in such things, attempt to compel obedience, and thus become the cause of apostasy, and of an open schism.*"[1] In opposition to the pope's practice of carrying on war with worldly weapons, he says: "Those who are anxious for the safety of this chair, are much afraid that the threatening words of our Lord will be fulfilled on it, 'He who takes the sword, shall perish with the sword.'"

This bishop, after his return to England, committed the whole charge of managing the external affairs of his office to the hands of another person, reserving to himself the purely spiritual duties, which he could thus discharge to much greater advantage. He entered heartily into the business of visiting the different parts of his diocese, and laid himself out especially to preach the gospel everywhere. Preaching, he looked upon, in general, as one of the most important parts of his pastoral office, and took every pains to stir up the zeal of his clergy in it. No consideration would prevail upon him to induct clergymen, whom he did not think qualified for the performance of this duty. An attempt was made from Rome, to compel this excellent man to confer a benefice within his foundation on a mere boy,— one of those papal favorites, who, besides being destitute of every spiritual qualification, could speak nothing but Italian. But he was steadfast in refusing to obey a *mandatum apostolicum* of this sort, declaring, "he was ready to pay filial obedience to the apostolical mandates, as also, he contended against everything which was at variance with the apostolical mandates; to both, he was obligated by the divine law; for an apostolical mandate was only one which agreed with the doctrine of the apostles and of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose place was especially filled by the pope in the church; for Christ himself says, 'whosoever is not with me is against me.' But the above document stood in no sort of conformity with the holiness of the apostolical chair; for by such papal ordinances, which, by the phrase '*non obstante*,' superseded all existing rules, the most shameless effrontery in lying and deceiving was encouraged, to the great injury of the Christian life and of social order, and all mutual confidence destroyed. Then again, after the sin of Satan and of anti-Christ, there was none more abominable than that of plunging souls to destruction by an unfaithful discharge of the pastoral office. The apostolical chair, on which was conferred by our Lord all power for building up, not for pulling down, neither ought, therefore, nor could possibly ordain anything, which would lead to such a sin; and no man, who was truly

[1] Absit et quod existentibus aliquibus aliquando veraciter Christo cognitis non volentibus quocunque modo voluntati ejus contraire haec sedes et in ea praesidentes praecipiendo talibus Christi voluntate oppositum causa sint discessionis aut schismatis apparentis.

obedient to that sacred chair, and had not cut himself off from the body of Jesus Christ, could obey such commands; but, even though they should proceed from the highest class of angels, must resist them with all his might." He repeated it at the close of his letter: "The fulness of power means solely the power of doing everything for the edification of the church; by no means that which tends to her destruction. Those papal provisions tended not to edification, but most evidently to destruction. The apostolical chair could not therefore approve of such provisions; for flesh and blood, which cannot be partakers of the kingdom of God, have revealed this; not the Father of Jesus Christ, which is in heaven."[1] Amidst positions and maxims of church doctrine, the principle forces its way through, in this witness of the truth, that faith clings only to Christ, and must examine and prove everything by its relation to him, to his spirit and laws. Zealous as this bishop was in defence of the papal authority, he himself maintaining in the contest with the king of England, that the pope must be supported with money during his exile in France, still, his whole mode of action proceeds from the principle, as its starting-point, that men are bound to obey the pope only so far as they actually recognize in him the organ of Christ; so far as his commands harmonize with Christ's doctrines.

The pope, who was accustomed to triumph over the mightiest princes, was greatly exasperated at this boldness of an English bishop, and would have gladly made him feel at once the absoluteness of his papal power. But some cardinals kept him back; for their bad consciences made them dread the force of the public discontent, provoked by so many abuses proceeding from and promoted by the Roman court, and the voice of truth, supported by the personal authority of the worthy bishop. They held that it would be better to keep still, and so prevent the sensation which the affair might create.[2]

A legend recorded by Matthew of Paris, in his historical work, deserves to be noticed as characteristic of the times, and showing the influence which the corruption of the Roman court had on the public judgment. The pope is said to have intended to avenge himself on the pious and free-spirited bishop after his death, which shortly occurred, by causing his bones to be disinterred; but one night the bishop appeared to him, and, fixing on him a stern and threatening look, struck him upon the side with his crosier. This made so profound an impression on the pope, that, from that day onward, pursued by one divine judgment after another, he had not a moment's repose.[3] So in the descriptions generally, which the English historian, Matthew of

[1] See Matthew of Paris, f. 570.

[2] Deserving of notice is the presentiment of a fall of the Romish church, to be brought about by this corruption proceeding from Rome, which expresses itself in the way in which Matthew of Paris accounts for the concern expressed by many cardinals: Maxime propter hoc, quia scitur, quod quandoque discessio est ventura.

[3] Matthew of Paris, f. 760: Et qui vivum noluerat audire corripientem, senserat mortuum impingentem. Nec unquam postea ipse papa unum bonum diem vel prosperum continuavit usque ad noctem vel noctem usque ad diem, sed insomnem vel malæ tam.

Paris, gives of the later popes of this century, and in the legends recorded by him of their reappearance after death, we see what an unfavorable influence the abuse of the papal power must have had on the tone of public feeling; and the indignation of the German people against the popes already expressed itself strongly in the songs and ballads of the thirteenth century.[1]

When pope Alexander the Fourth commenced his administration with requesting that all Christians would pray for him, it was hoped that this pontiff would distinguish himself advantageously from his predecessors. But his subsequent conduct, the course he pursued in exacting contributions from the churches, contradicted these hopes, and his earlier professions appeared to be mere hypocrisy and a mask to cover a worldly spirit.[2]

The factions among the worldly-minded cardinals made it possible to keep the papal chair vacant during a space of three years from the year 1269. At length, in 1271, they agreed in the choice of an ecclesiastic from Liege, then absent at Ptolemais on a crusade under prince Edward of England. He took the name of Gregory the Tenth.

This pope had already bound himself to the cause of the crusades, while in the East. He therefore felt called upon to make the preparation of another a special object of attention; and this was one of the objects for which he called together the general council at Lyons, in the year 1274, the most important transaction of his administration. But, in this century, the public sentiment had already undergone a great change on the subject of crusades; after so many unsuccessful efforts, the zeal once so easily enlisted in these undertakings had abated. The popes of this century, when they raised their voice and fired the people to embark in such wars, could no longer rely on the *universal confidence*, which met their predecessors half-way in the twelfth century. The exactions which they were in the habit of making, under pretext of the crusades, had greatly injured these in the public opinion.[3] The repeated failures of the crusades led many to doubt the goodness of the cause; and the faith of those who were accustomed to make up their judgments according to the dictates of a sensuous religion, received a violent shock from the unfortunate issue of the cause which they had regarded as a divine one, from the victory of Mohammedan arms over the banner of the cross.[4] Others, who had attained

See passages of this sort collected in Stäudlin's Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte, iv. 3tes St. § 549.

[2] Matthew of Paris, f. 795: Hypocrisin reputant et saecularitatis palliationem quamplurimi. Spes praeconcepta de sanctitate papae prorsus evanuit exsufflata. In excuse of the pope he says afterwards, that many things were done in his name, and by deceiving him, of which he was entirely innocent: Veruntamen multorum auribus veraciter instillatum est, quod de bulla decepto papa fraus committitur multiformis; but he adds immediately that the pope could not be excused on this ground: Sed haec ratio, si tamen ratio est, papam non excusat.

[3] Matthew of Paris says expressly, that the exactions of Gregory the Ninth did permanent injury to the cause of the crusades in England. Quod fidelium circa negotium crucis tepuit, imo potius caritas refriguit generalis. Unde negotium terrae sanctae nunquam felix super hoc suscepit incrementum. At the year 1234, f. 340.

[4] Matthew of Paris remarks, at the year 1250, f. 672: Coeperunt multi, quos firma fides non roboraverat, desperatione contabescere. Et fides heu! heu! multorum coepit vacillare, dicentium ad invicem: U

to a higher position of Christian faith and knowledge, were either led by the issue of the crusades, or else availed themselves of it, to express the conviction openly, that men must attack unbelievers with other weapons than these, and employ the forces of Christendom for other objects than these.

As early as the close of the twelfth century, the abbot Joachim, of Calabria, a man earnestly desirous for a better state of the church, had spoken with remarkable freedom against the zeal for the crusades. "How many are there at the present time," said he,[1] "soliciting the pope that he would cause the badge of the cross to be marked on the shoulders of Christians, and really intending, under the pretext of going to the rescue of a desolate and rejected Jerusalem, to draw gain and temporal advantage to themselves out of piety. They consider not how bad it is for men to oppose the divine counsels; as when the restoration of the walls of Jericho was forbidden with a curse; 1 Kings 16: 34; Joshua 6: 26." He represents, therefore, the restoration of Jerusalem as a project opposed to the declarations of Christ concerning the destruction of that city. He then adds: "Let the popes see to it, and mourn over *their own* Jerusalem, that is, the universal church, not built by the hands of men, which God has redeemed with his own blood; and not over the fallen Jerusalem But if the nations fight for the glorious sepulchre of our Lord, let them understand that it is not this which the Lord will raise to heaven; but rather the holy souls in whom the Lord, daily buried, by the mystery of piety, reposes and dwells, till he shall exalt them to the kingdom of his everlasting glory."[2] And, in another place, he complains of the popes that, by their means, the nations and resources of Christendom are exhausted among barbarous tribes, whither they are sent under the specious pretexts of salvation and the cross.[3]

The objections urged against the crusades by a party who were opposed to them at the time of the council of Lyons, are known from the manner in which Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominican order, whom the pope had commissioned to draw up a schedule of the matters to be handled at that council, sought to refute them.[4] They were such as follows: That it was contrary to the examples of Christ and the apostles, to uphold religion with the sword, and to shed the blood of unbelievers. It was tempting God; because the Saracens were in all respects, in numbers, in knowledge of the country, in

quid dereliquit nos Christus, pro quo et cui hactenus militavimus?

[1] Commentar. in Jeremiam, p. 284.

[2] Videant summi pontifices et doleant de sua Hierusalem, id est, ecclesia generali non manu facta, quam Deus redemit sanguine suo, et non de illa, quae cecidit desistantque ulterius illius muros erigere, quae quotidie morte fidelium ruit. Ac si pro sepulcro glorioso de gentibus contenditur, non est ipsum dominus translaturus in coelum; sed potius sanctas animas, in quibus dominus quotidie per pietatis mysterium sepelitur, quiescit et manet, donec eas transferat et resurgant in regno claritatis aeternae.

[3] Romani pontifices dissipant sepem imperii, imminuendis populis christianis et viribus et mittendis ad barbaras nationes sub specie salutis et crucis. P. 292.

[4] Humbertus de Romanis de his quae tractanda videbantur in Concilio generali. The first part, which consists of 27 chapters, de negotio ecclesiae contra Saracenos. Extracts in Mansi, t. xxvi, f. 109. More full, in the first part of the Opusculum tripartitum, published by Brown, in the Appendix to the Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum, f. 185, seqq.

being accustomed to the climate, in means of subsistence, superior to the Christians. Though Christians might be allowed to fight in self-defence, yet it did not follow from this that they might attack the infidels in their own countries. It was no more right to persecute those Saracens, than it was to persecute the Jews, the idolaters, the subjugated Saracens in Europe. These wars brought neither spiritual nor temporal advantage. The Saracens were provoked by them to blaspheme the Christian faith, instead of being converted to that faith; but all of them that fell in battle sank to perdition. Nor was any temporal advantage gained from them; for it was impossible to retain possession of the conquered territories. The unhappy reverses which had been experienced, proved that these undertakings were not in accordance with the divine will. Particularly deserving of notice is what Humbert says in refutation of the first of these reasons, "That which was right and proper at the time of the first planting of the church is one thing; that which is required in order to preserve the church is another. To preserve the church, to defend it against those who would utterly destroy it, the sword is required. The condition of the first Christian communities, when as yet they had no power, but could only propagate themselves by humility, is quite different from the present condition of things, when the Christian people are become mighty, and not without good reason bear the sword. In earlier times, the church was defended by the gift of miracles; at present, when miracles fail, she must have recourse to arms. What is said against the employment of weapons, has reference not to the outward act, but to the *temper*, with which they should be used."[1] While, in former times, the crusades had been extolled as a means whereby the vicious who embarked in them might obtain the pardon of their sins, Humbert, on the other hand, represented it as a main cause of the want of success, that precisely this class of persons had been employed; and he proposed that a competent number of pious warriors should be constantly maintained in the East as a bulwark against the Saracens.[2]

We have already, on a former page,[3] described the glowing zeal of that extraordinary man, Raymund Lull, for the conversion of the infidels and the extension of the Christian church. The aim of his first efforts was to bring it about, that missions and arms should be conjoined for the accomplishment of these objects. In a work which he composed at Pisa, soon after his return in April, A. D. 1308, from North Africa,[4] he recommended three things; first, that four or five monasteries should be founded, in which learned and pious monks and secular clergymen might study the languages of the infidels, and thus prepare

[1] Ad praeparationem animi, non ad executionem gladii.

[2] Ad quod eligerentur non homicidae aut pessimi sicut hactenus, sed homines a peccatis abstinentes, quia nescit justitia Dei patrocinari criminosis, f. 119.

[3] See ante, pp. 61–71. I could not then as yet avail myself of the great collected edition of the works of Raymund Lull, which appeared at Mayence. After the printing of this section was finished, I first had the good fortune, during a residence in Munich, of being able to study this work also, among the numerous and rare treasures of the Royal library in that city.

[4] Disputatio Raymundi Christiani et Hamar Saraceni.

themselves for preaching the gospel in the whole world. Secondly, that out of all the orders of spiritual knights, a single one should be formed for fighting against the Saracens. But this order of knights should not embark at once, as had been done before, in distant enterprises, but should first attack the empire of the Saracens in Granada, and take possession of their treasures; next, proceed to North Africa, and, last of all, buckle on their armor for the conquest of the Holy Land. Thirdly, the tenths from all the churches should be applied to this object until the holy sepulchre should be recovered. In another work,[1] he introduces two ecclesiastics disputing on the question, whether it were better that some mighty prince should be commissioned to bring about the conversion of the heathen by force, or whether men should labor for the spread of the faith, by means of persuasion, and by offering up their lives, according to the example of Christ and of the martyrs. Even at this period, he declared in favor of the latter plan; and to the close of his life he felt more and more convinced that this was the only Christian mode of procedure, the only one which any Christian could expect would be crowned with a blessing. In his great work, on the Contemplation of God,[2] where he makes all the ranks and callings of Christendom pass in review, and seeks to point out the defects in each,[3] he remarks in the section concerning knights:[4] "I see many knights going to the Holy Land, in the expectation of conquering it by force of arms; but instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves." "Therefore," says he, addressing Christ, "it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be attempted in no other way than as thou and thy apostles undertook to accomplish it,—by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives. As it seems that the possession of the holy sepulchre and of the Holy Land can be better secured by the force of preaching than the force of arms, therefore let the monks march forth, as holy knights, glittering with the sign of the cross, replenished with the grace of the Holy Spirit, and proclaim to the infidels the truth of thy passion; let them from love to thee exhaust the whole fountain of their eyes, and pour out all the blood of their bodies, as thou hast done from love to them! Many are the knights and noble princes that have gone to the promised land with a view to conquer it; but if this mode had been pleasing to thee, O Lord, they would assuredly have wrested it from the Saracens who possess it

[1] Liber super Psalmum "quicunque vult."

[2] T. ix, opp. ed. Mogunt. 1722, fol.

[3] To finish which work, that he might then go to meet martyrdom, was his most ardent wish; as he remarks, c. cxxxi, f. 301: "As a hungry man makes despatch, and takes large morsels, on account of his great hunger, so thy servant feels a great desire to die, that he may glorify thee. He hurries day and night to complete this work, in order that, after it is finished, he may give up his blood and his tears to be shed for thee, in the Holy Land where thou didst pour out thy precious blood and thy compassionate tears. O Lord, my help, till this work is completed, thy servant cannot go to the land of the Saracens, to glorify thy glorious name, for I am so occupied with this work, which I undertake for thine honor, that I can think of nothing else. For this reason, I beseech thee for that grace that thou wouldst stand by me, that I may soon finish it and speedily depart to die the death of a martyr out of love to thee, if it shall please thee to count me worthy of it"

[4] Chap. cxii, f. 250.

against our will. Thus is it made manifest to the pious monks, that thou art daily waiting for them, expecting them to do, from love to thee, what thou hast done from love to them. And they may be certain that, if from love to thee, they expose themselves to martyrdom, thou wilt hear their prayers in respect to all that which they desire to see accomplished in this world for the promotion of thy glory." And, in another passage of this work,[1] he seeks to show, first, that the schism of souls, the religious strife, between Saracens and Christians, was the cause of the outward war, and of the many evils therewith connected;[2] that by this war, Christians were hindered from preaching the truth to the Saracens, whereby they might, perhaps, succeed to convince them, and then, through the spiritual communion of one faith, bring them back to outward peace also. He then concludes with the following prayer: "Lord of heaven, Father of all times, when thou didst send thy Son to take upon him human nature, he and his apostles lived in outward peace with Jews, Pharisees, and other men; for never, by outward violence, did they capture or slay any of the unbelievers or of those who persecuted them. Of this outward peace they availed themselves to bring the erring to the knowledge of the truth, and to a communion of spirit with themselves. And so, after thy example, should Christians conduct towards the Saracens. But since that ardor of devotion which glowed in apostles and holy men of old no longer inspires us. love and devotion through almost the whole world have grown cold. Therefore do Christians expend their efforts far more in the outward than in the spiritual conflict."

At the above-mentioned council of Lyons, Gregory again introduced a new regulation with regard to papal elections, designed to prevent such delay as that which had preceded his own appointment. The cardinals should at least be compelled by hunger to agree in a choice. Each having his own particular cell, should remain there without liberty of leaving it until they were prepared to proceed to the election. After three days the quantity of food and drink should be diminished, and if at the expiration of eight days they had not yet agreed in their choice of a pope, they should be allowed nothing but bread, wine, and water. This ordinance, after great resistance on the part of the cardinals, was adopted; and as it was exceedingly annoying to them, they made the greater despatch, such persons being selected as were not expected to live long, and in whose choice it was the most easy to unite. In the single year 1276, three popes followed in quick succession one after the other. The third of these, John the Twenty-First was, by the influence of the cardinals, induced to suspend an arrangement of the conclave which they felt to be so

[1] T. ix, l. iii, Distinct. 29, c. cciv, f. 512.

[2] Quia Christiani et Saraceni pugnant intellectualiter in hoc, quod discordent et contrarientur in fide, propterea pugnant sensualiter et ratione hujus pugnae multi vulnerantur et captivantur et moriuntur et destruuntur, per quam destructionem devastantur et destruuntur multi principatus et multae divitiae et multae terrae et impediuntur multa bona, quae fierent, si non esset talis pugna.

inconvenient. The consequence was that, in the year 1292, the election of a pope was delayed by parties among the cardinals two years and a quarter. At length, compelled by the influence of Charles the Second, king of Naples, and to get rid of a disgraceful dependence on him, in which they found themselves placed, they resolved to choose somebody, and, as they could agree on no one else, their choice fell on a man, who under any other circumstances they would hardly have thought of, and who formed a direct contrast to his predecessor. This was Peter of Morone, a pious anchoret, who lived not far from Sulmone, in the Neapolitan territory, — an old man, who from his twentieth year had led a solitary life, devoted to prayer and religious contemplation,[1] and had composed a few small tracts on ascetical subjects, and on ecclesiastical law.[2] Against his wishes, he was obliged to exchange the tranquillity of the contemplative life for a sphere of action of the most enormous extent and full of unrest. He called himself Celestin the Fifth. Even when pope, he still wore his monkish dress under the papal insignia. His appearance and deportment, forming so striking a contrast with that of the other popes of this time, procured for him the more respect and veneration. Seated upon an ass, which the kings of Sicily and Hungary led by the bridle, he made his entry into the city of Aquila. Thousands flocked about him, not as they did around other new popes, to obtain rich benefices, but to receive his blessing. The shouts of the multitudes, who gathered from city and country, compelled him to show himself frequently at the window and bestow his blessing.[3] But when Celestin, the feeble old man, came to be placed in circumstances so little conformable to his habits and temperament; when he was set down in the midst of a vast circle of business with which he was entirely unacquainted; he soon brought affairs into the most vexatious perplexity. Always following the direction of the papal officials, he subscribed and affixed the papal seal to rolls of parchment, negligently read or even not written on, which could be filled up at pleasure; he made himself dependent on king Charles the Second, who persuaded him to fix his seat in his own residential city. The cardinals grew tired of him; it was easy for them to excite scruples of conscience in his mind; and, besides, he longed to be restored to his former quiet. Gladly would he have resigned his seat. But on the principles of the church constitution and of the ecclesiastical laws as then understood, it was very difficult to see how the pope, who was invested with the highest dignity on earth, could be divested of his office, or could voluntarily resign it. Yet cardinal Benedict Cajetan, than whom no one could be more

[1] He himself wrote an account of his youth, his inward conflicts and visions, in the commencement of his spiritual career: See Acta Sanctor. Maj. t. iv, f. 422.

[2] These writings, which are of no particular importance, are published in the Bibl. patr. Lugdunens, t. xxv.

[3] Benedict Cajetan relates this in his life of Celestin: Tantus fuit concursus ad ipsum de villis et castris, quod stupor erat videre, quia magis veniebant ad suam obtinendam benedictionem, quam pro praebendae acquisitione, unde oportebat eum saepius ad fenestram accedere, ad benedicendum populum victus ipsorum clamoribus, quod et ego vidi et praesens fui quando ista fiebant. See Acta Sanctor. Maj. t iv, f. 427.

unlike this pope in temper and disposition, and who himself aspired to the papal dignity, strengthened him in his inclination; so, after having published, by the advice of the latter, an ordinance, purporting that it was allowable for a pope to abdicate his office, he laid down his own in the year 1294, and returned to his former mode of life.

It will be evident from this history of the papacy that, from the time of Gregory the Seventh, it had come into a new relation with the rest of the church. Not only was it assumed, as it had been already in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, that the form of the government of the church is *monarchical;* but the government became an *unlimited monarchy;* — the triumph of papal absolutism was complete. All other ecclesiastical authority was but the pope's organ, was valid only to the extent he might choose. No longer tied by the old ecclesiastical laws, he could render them powerless by dispensations, explanations, and laws newly enacted. There were, indeed, distinguished men, and zealous for the well-being of the church, who — much as they were devoted in other respects to the interest of the papacy, or rather because they were so — often took pains to remind the popes, that they *must* fix limits to their own authority, which had not been limited from without, by reason of the end for which such authority had been conferred. Thus, for example, bishop Yves of Chartres, declared, "That the Roman church had received no authority from God for injustice, — no authority to take away from any man his guilt, but only to bind what ought to be bound, and to loose what ought to be loosed."[1] The abbot Gottfried of Vendome, also, against whom Yves had cited this principle, because in a particular case he would acknowledge *dependence only on the Roman church*, — admitted the same as an undeniable truth.[2] "One thing only," he said, "might be disputed, namely, whether, in the particular case in question, the pope had made made such arbitrary use of his authority." The abbot Peter of Cluny reminded pope Innocent the Second,[3] that if he ruled over all, it should be his glory to be ruled himself only by reason.[4] We have already quoted the sayings of abbot Bernard of Clairvaux on this subject, namely, that popes were created not to dissolve the ecclesiastical laws, but to see that they were executed. John of Salisbury, that zealous champion of the hierarchy, wrote thus to pope Alexander the Third, in the name of the archbishop of Canterbury:[5] "Undoubtedly, to the pope, all things are allowable; that is, all things that belong by divine right to ecclesiastical authority. He is free to make new laws and to do away the old ones. Only it is not in his power to change anything which, by the word of God, has eternal validity. I might venture to assert that not even Peter himself can

[1] Nullam injustam potestatem, fidem violandi videlicet debita sua cuique non reddendi; sed tantum, quae sunt liganda ligandi et quae sunt solvenda solvendi. See ep. 195.

[2] Quis enim insanus credere vel cogitare audeat, bonum Deum aliquid unquam injuste dedisse aut ejus sanctam ecclesiam quicquam ab eo injuste accepisse. Epp. l. ii, ep. 11.

[3] Ep. ii, 28.

[4] Cum jure majestas apostolica omnibus dominetur, soli tantum rationi subjici gloriatur.

[5] Ep. 193.

absolve any one from his guilt who perseveres in sin or in the will to sin; that even he has received no such key as gives him power to open the door of the kingdom of heaven for an impenitent person."

Still, in such voices, it was but a force of moral sentiment that opposed itself to the arbitrary will of the pope. There was no higher authority, which the popes were obliged to respect, which presented to them checks from without, and could have jurisdiction over them. The general councils, which constituted the highest tribunal and the highest legislative authority in the ancient church, had themselves become converted into blind tools of the popes. Such authority in the hands of a single man, standing at the head of the whole Western church, might undoubtedly, in the then rude condition of the nations, be productive of much good, as a check on the trifling caprices of secular rulers, and as a terror to the vast multitude of negligent bishops; but even in the best use of that authority the free original development could not fail to suffer a check. This check, *in the best use of the papal power*, would of necessity become the stronger, inasmuch as, in such a case, the reaction favorable to the upward struggle of freedom would be less powerfully called forth. Naturally, however, such power in the hands of an individual was liable to manifold abuses. In order that the papacy might ever subserve the end for which it was designed, an harmonious combination of the highest mental and moral powers, purity of heart united with great intellectual superiority, was absolutely required; and such a combination could not often occur. Add to this that, already in the twelfth century, a too-powerful secular tendency had grown up within the pale of the papacy, which threatened to swallow up the spiritual interest. Already must the provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg complain, that the *ecclesia Romana* had become a *curia Romana*,[1] and we have already heard the complaints of the abbot Bernard on the secularization of the papacy. Every corrupt practice, which was accustomed to prevail in courts, reigned at the Roman court;[2] and if the Hildebrandian tendency of reform

[1] The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg had, as he says, laid at the feet of pope Eugene the Third, his Essay on the Confusion between Babylon and Jerusalem, from which grew afterwards his work so often cited: "De corrupto ecclesiae statu," or, "expositio in Ps. 64." in Baluz, Miscellan. t. v. Hac intentione, ut curia illa semetipsam attenderet seseque pariter et ecclesiam totam, quam regere debet, a confusione Babylonica distinctam exhibere satageret sine macula et ruga *neque enim vel hoc ipsum carere macula videtur, quod nunc dicitur curia Romana*, quae antehac dicebatur ecclesia Romana, c. lxiii.

[2] John of Salisbury, who stood on terms of intimacy with pope Adrian the Fourth, relates a remarkable conversation which he once had with that pope. The pontiff inquired of him respecting the general tone of feeling towards the Romish church, and towards himself; and he frankly stated to him the complaints concerning the exactions that proceeded from the church of Rome. Sicut enim dicebatur a multis Romana ecclesia, quae mater omnium ecclesiarum est, se non tam matrem exhibet aliis, quam novercam. Sedent in ea scribae et Pharisaei, ponentes onera importabilia in humeris hominum, quae digito non contingunt. Concutiunt ecclesias, lites excitant, collidunt clerum et populum, laboribus et miseriis afflictorum nequaquam compatiuntur, ecclesiarum laetantur spoliis et quaestum omnem reputant pietatem. Omnia cum pretio hodie, sed nec cras aliquid sine pretio obtinebis. Nocent saepius et in eo daemones imitantur, quod tunc prodesse putantur, cum nocere desistunt exceptis paucis, qui nomen et officium pastoris implent. The pope calmly listened to all he had to say, and thanked him for his frankness; and after having conceded some things and justified others, concluded with

had aimed to bring back the church to its purely spiritual character, to deliver it from the yoke of secularization, yet this secularization sprung up again in another form, from the mixing up together of court and church in Rome. The complaints about the corruptibility of the Roman court, of the officials by whom the judgment of the popes was influenced or determined,— these complaints, which we have already noticed as existing in the preceding periods, only went on multiplying with the increased influence of the papacy. It must have appeared strange, that, on the very spot where simony, as practised by the princes and bishops, was so vigorously combated, the same thing, though under more specious names, should prevail to no less an extent. When the odious charge was issued from Rome against bishop Yves of Chartres, that simony reigned openly in his church, he replied: "He had not as yet been able to do anything towards suppressing the ancient custom by which the candidates for a canonry must pay something to the deans and the cantor; for men appealed to the example of the Romish church itself, where the *cubicularii* and *ministri sacri palatii* demanded no small sum of money for the consecration of bishops and abbots, under the specious names of an *oblatio* or a *benedictio*.[1] Not the stroke of a pen, not a sheet of paper, was to be had for nothing. He knew not how to answer those who brought this matter against him, except in the words of Christ: "All whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works." Matth. 23: 3. Disputes about election in churches and convents, carried up to Rome for decision, were welcomed there by those whose only object was money, because the contending parties must resort to gold in order to effect their object.[2] The officers of the papal court were bribed by

an apology like the following: All the members of the body complained of the stomach, that whilst they were all obliged to labor for that, the stomach was idle, and did nothing but consume what was furnished to it by the labor of all the other members. They declared it the enemy of all, and determined to punish it, to rest from their labors and starve it out. Thus passed several days, till all the members had become quite faint, and were no longer able to perform their appropriate functions. They were now under the necessity of holding another consultation; they found out that, in consequence of withholding everything from the stomach, that organ had been unable to supply them any longer with what was requisite to give them strength and vigor. They found themselves compelled, therefore, to restore back to it all they had withheld, and now the members were strong and vigorous again, and peace was restored to the whole. So it was with those who ruled in the church or in the state. Although they required much, yet it was not for their own advantage, but for the good of the whole. If they were not rich and mighty themselves, they could not help the members. Noli ergo neque nostrum neque saecularium principum duritiam metiri, sed omnium utilitatem attende. See Joh. Saresberiensis Policraticus sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum, l. vi, c. xxiv.

[1] Quae oblationis vel benedictionis nomine palliantur. Ep. 133.

[2] We present a few examples. Near the close of the twelfth century, Peter de Blois complains of the fact that a homo illiteratus et laicus, sed in emendis honoribus circumspectus, was endeavoring by means of his gold to establish in Rome his illegal claims to an abbot's place in Canterbury. He was there received in a friendly manner by those, qui sicut scitis gratius acceptant hominum munera, quam merita personarum. Sperabant enim, quod promotio ejus esset rixae materia et majoris emolumenti occasio. His party exerted themselves to the utmost to make themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness at the Roman court, and thereby to nullify the just charges brought against this man (opinionis et infamiae vulneribus vinum et oleum infundere). Exhaustis itaque Flandriae mercatoribus in argento, a Romanis tandem infinitam multitudinem auri mutuavit. Ep. 158. The abbot Guibert, of

presents or promises, and then sought to mislead the judgment of the pope. This was the ordinary way of gaining a bad cause.[1] Surrounded by such a swarm of corrupt courtiers, it was not enough, therefore, that the individual who stood at the head should be rigidly incorruptible and disinterested. Eugene the Third is extolled as a model in this respect.[2] But he should also possess the power of control over the corrupt creatures around him, and wisdom to detect the fraudulent acts by which truth was kept back from him. Bernard had good reason, therefore, for remarking to this very Eugene:[3] "Of what avail is the good disposition of the individual, when still the bad disposition of others predominates!"

We shall now proceed to consider the several branches of the papal authority, as they were separately exercised, by themselves.

II. Distinct Branches of the Papal Church Government.

Important effects undoubtedly resulted from the fact that the popes visited particular countries in person, and spent some time in them.[4] We have seen how the events which compelled them to take refuge in France, operated in giving a new spring to their authority. Still, the cases were quite rare in which they could obtain, by their personal presence, a knowledge of the condition of particular nations and churches, counteract abuses which had crept in, and lend force to their laws. There was need of a permanent and general order of men, to serve as a substitute for the immediate personal presence of the pope. To this end served the cardinals, or other persons from the clergy, clothed with plenary powers, who, under the name of legates, were sent to all quarters of the world. To be sure, a legate whose knowledge of the country was only such as could be derived from a transient residence in it, and from superficial observation, might easily be deceived by appearances. For which reason, Yves of Chartres wished that the popes would, as was sometimes done indeed, appoint as their legates the bishops in the countries themselves, who would be accurately acquainted with the region and its relations.[5] Against this

Novigentum, says, in his autobiography, in the beginning of the twelfth century, l. iii, c. iv, f. 498, concerning the palatinis Papae: Quibus moris est, ut audito auri nomine mansuescant. A bishop who was suspected, on good reasons, of having committed a murder for the sake of revenge, found means to clear himself, adulatione donorum, at the Roman court, under pope Paschalis the Second.

[1] Ep. 87. Of bishop Yves of Chartres, John of Salisbury writes (ep. 222): Romanos amicis verba dare jam nemo miratur, quia percelebre est, et innotuit universis, quod apud eos, quantum quisque nummorum habet in arca, tantum habet et fidei, et plerumque obliquata mente legum et canonum, qui munere potior est, potentior est jure

[2] A prior, whose case he had not yet examined, once pressed him to accept from him a mark of gold, as a testimony of regard; but he declined, saying, "Thou hast not as yet stepped into the house, and already wouldst thou bribe the master?" Joh. Saresb. Policrat. l. v, cxv.

[3] See on a former page, 152.

[4] This subject, the influence which proceeded from the journeyings of the popes in the Middle Ages, deserved certainly to be more accurately investigated in a fuller Monography than Johann von Müller's Essay, von den Reisen der Päpste.

[5] Cum enim a latere vestro mittitis ad nos cardinales vestros, quia in transitu

well-meant proposal, however, it might be objected, that native legates were more exposed than foreign ones to the influence of impure motives and considerations, — which difficulty might be illustrated by examples.

Much could be effected in these times by a legate, who, as Bernard required, should interest himself for the people and the poor in their spiritual and bodily necessities, steadfastly oppose himself to the arbitrary will of the mighty, and everywhere promote the supremacy of order and of law.[1] Bernard cites examples of such legates, who avoided the very appearance of self-interest. A certain cardinal, Martin, returned back from a distant country to Italy so poor that, in Florence, he found himself without money or means to continue his journey except on foot; whereupon, the bishop of Florence made him a present of a horse. He next met with this bishop in Pisa, where the papal court then resided; and here being told that the bishop had a process going on and was depending upon his vote, he gave the horse back to him on the spot. Bishop Gottfried of Chartres refused to accept from a priest the present of a costly fish, except on condition that he might be allowed to pay the price of it. But Bernard, in relating these facts, could not help exclaiming, "Does it not seem like a story of some other world, that a legate should return with his purse empty of gold, from the very land of gold?" He had himself to complain of a legate, who, in Germany and France, left everywhere behind him the marks of his wickedness,[2] everywhere sought to place beautiful boys in high offices in the church, and everywhere made such exactions, that many preferred *purchasing a release from him, that he might not come near them.* Bishop Yves of Chartres invites pope Urban the Second to send on a legate, because there was special need of a person clothed with such authority, when arbitrary will everywhere ruled supreme, when there was nothing which any man might not dare to do, and dare with impunity; but at the same time, he asked for a legate of good name and reputation, who would seek not his own, but the things of Jesus Christ.[3] The same bishop wrote to a legate a beautiful letter,[4] reproving him for his inconsistency in zealously contending against lay-investiture, while he did not give himself the least concern about many openly prevailing vices. "He wished," he said, "with many pious men, that the servants of the Romish church would, like experienced physicians, seek first to heal the greater disorders, and not give occasion for their banterers to say that they strained at gnats and swallowed camels."

Under this head belongs, again, the authority exercised by the Ro-

apud nos sunt, non tantum non possunt curanda curare, sed nec curanda prospicere; hence, ut alicui transalpino legationem sedis apostolicae injungatis, qui et vicinius subrepentia mala cognoscat et ea vel per se vel per relationem ad sedem apostolicam maturius curare praevaleat. Ep. 109.

[1] Qui vulgus non spernant, sed doceant, divites non palpent, sed terreant, minas principum non paveant, sed contemnant, gloriantes, non quod curiosa seu pretiosa quaeque in terram attulerint, sed quod reliquerint pacem regnis, legem barbaris, quietem monasteriis, ecclesiis ordinem, clericis disciplinam. De considerat. l. iv, c. iv.

[2] Vir apostolicus replevit omnia non evangelio, sed sacrilegio. Ep. 290.

[3] Ep. 12. [4] Ep. 60.

man curia, as the highest tribunal; a tribunal, to which appeal could be made from the whole of Western Christendom, in all matters that stood in any relation whatsoever to the church. Salutary as this branch of the papal authority, rightly used, might have proved, it would in the same proportion turn out hurtful, when every appeal was received without discrimination at Rome; and corruption by bribes, partiality, zeal, — not for justice and law, — but only for ambitious projects and the dignity of the church of Rome, prevailed there; when, as men were forced to complain was really the case, he who appealed to the ecclesiastical laws instead of leaving everything to depend solely on the plenary power of the pope, was already put down as an enemy of that church.[1] In this way, appeals would necessarily result in effects directly contrary to the end for which they were instituted. They no longer served the purpose of procuring protection for the weak and oppressed against the will of the mighty, but much more of securing for arbitrary power a convenient handle by which to thwart the execution of the laws and defeat the ends of justice. Every sentence, however just and lawful, could, by an arbitrary appeal on the part of him whose selfish interests it opposed, or whose sole object it was to revenge himself on an enemy, be either reversed, or at least seriously retarded in its execution. As early as the year 1129, Hildebert, bishop of Mans, found cause for declaring, in a free-spirited letter to pope Honorius the Second, that all church discipline would come to an end, all vices must get the upperhand, if, as the case had hitherto been, every appeal should without distinction be admitted at Rome; he calls upon him to provide, that appeals without good reasons assigned, and that aimed only to procure a delay of justice, should be wholly rejected.[2] Bernard advised pope Eugene the Third not to listen to every man's story, but sometimes to strike in with the rod.[3] Men came at length to perceive, therefore, in Rome itself, the necessity of setting limits to arbitrary appeals. The eminent wisdom of Innocent the Third as a ruler, was shown in this matter as well as in others; while at the same time, however, his ordinances testify of the enormous abuses which were practised in the matter of appeals.[4] He directed, at the fourth Lateran council, A. D. 1215, that bishops should not be hindered, by any appeal, from punishing the transgressions of their subjects, and from the reformation of their dioceses, unless they had violated the legal forms.[5]

[1] Yves of Chartres, ep. 67. Peter of Blois, ep. 158: Leges et canones et quicquid de sacro eloquio ad nostrae partis assertionem poteramus inducere, funestum et sacrilegum reputabant nosque hostes Romanae ecclesiae publice judicabant. Men were not to cite any canones, or leges, but only (papal) privilegia.

[2] Moratorias appellationes et superfluas omnino a vestra elongendas esse audientia. Ep. 41.

[3] Non semper praebere aurem, quae audiat, sed aliquando et flagellum quod feriat.

[4] E. g. epp. ii, 13. Benignitate juris plurimi hodie abutentes in sui erroris defensionem assumunt, quod in gravaminum fuerat revelationem inventum, et ut suorum superiorum correctionem eludant, sine causa frequenter ad apostolicam sedem appellant. cf. i, 237; ii, 99; v, 23.

[5] Ut correctionis et reformationis officium libere valeant exercere, decernimus, ut executionem ipsorum nulla appellatio valeat impedire, nisi formam excesserint in talibus observandam, c. vii.

As by the Hildebrandian system, the whole government of the church was placed in the hands of the pope, and the bishops were to exercise some part of it only as his instruments; so it was but a consistent application of the principles contained in that system, when bishops, by the act of their institution, by the predicates they bestowed on themselves, came to be placed more and more in a relation of dependence on these unlimited rulers of the church. Had it not been for the reaction of the old ecclesiastical laws, which were still valid in church practice, the consequences flowing out of that system would have been realized much earlier than they were. That no choice of a bishop could be valid without the pope's confirmation was, properly, but a necessary deduction from that system; still, however, it came to be so considered only by slow degrees. Disputes on the choice of bishops furnished occasion, for the most part, for the practice of the individuals elected going themselves to Rome to secure the confirmation of their election; and thus this papal confirmation came more and more into use in the course of the thirteenth century. The formulary which designated bishops as appointed by the grace of God, was increased by adding, "and by the grace of the apostolical chair." At length, they were bound by oath to such obedience to the popes as vassals paid to their liege lords. This oath was similar to the one which Boniface first took to the pope.[1] From the time of Gregory the Seventh, the Italian metropolitans immediately subordinate to the church of Rome, placed themselves under such an oath; next, it was required of all metropolitans that received the pall from Rome; finally, of all bishops whatsoever. They bound themselves thereby to appear at every synod when cited by the popes; to keep secret whatever might be communicated to them either orally or in writing, by the popes; to treat the Roman legates with honor and respect; to provide them with everything they needed, and in all cases of necessity to stand by the popes with force of arms.

The popes, who at first contended against arbitrary appointments to church offices by princes, afterwards became chargeable themselves with the same arbitrary mode of procedure, to the great injury of the churches. It was first in the twelfth century, that they recommended by way of petition, to vacant benefices, individuals who had done eminent service for the Romish church. (Their recommendations still appear, under the modest name of *preces;* hence the persons recommended, are called *precistae.*) But in the beginning of the thirteenth century these *preces* were changed into *mandata;* and finally, the popes of this century took the liberty to supersede all other rights (by the formula "*non obstante*"), and to promote their favorites to vacant benefices in whatsoever country they might be found; insisting, with a threat of the ban, that their commands should be obeyed, as we have seen in the case of Robert, bishop of Lincoln. Thus could the most unfit and the most unworthy men be promoted to such offices; boys under age, or at least such as were entirely ignorant of the language

[1] Vol. iii, p. 48.

and manners of the people, where their field of action was assigned; men, who carried with them, wherever they went, all the Roman corruption of morals; or who if they preferred to enjoy, as absentees, the revenues of the benefices, hired underlings, who performed the spiritual functions in an altogether mechanical manner. The best use which the popes made of this authority was, when they provided in this way, for men who had done good service in the cultivation of letters, an appointment free from cares, which they could not otherwise have obtained.

We have seen already in the preceding period, how the papal power was advanced by the selfish interests of subordinate ecclesiastical authorities, who sought to make themselves independent of their immediate superiors. But when the popes, instead of keeping every other authority confined within its appropriate limits, and placing themselves in opposition to all arbitrary procedures, now sought to grasp all other power for themselves; when, to secure this end, they eagerly complied with the demands of those who wished to be freed from the troublesome oversight of their immediate superiors, the inevitable result was the destruction of all ecclesiastical order, and the promotion of all licentiousness. Thus abbots procured for themselves the insignia of the episcopal office,— sandals, mitre, and crosier; and privileges of exemption in respect to the diocesan authority of the bishops. Thus was taken away from the bishops the means of watching over all that transpired in their dioceses; and of punishing everything bad in them. We have seen on a former page,[1] how Bernard warned the pope against this arbitrary extension of his authority; and many other influential voices were heard in like manner to protest against these exemption-privileges. Thus Yves, bishop of Chartres,[2] complains to pope Urban the Second, of a monastery which sought to free itself by such an exemption from the diocesan oversight of the bishop of Paris, in order that it might suffer no disturbance in its licentious doings.[3] Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter filled with similar complaints, addressed to pope Alexander the Third,[4] quotes the language of one of these abbots who was striving to throw off the regular dependence on his bishop. He said: "The abbots, who do not annihilate the authority of the bishops, are poor creatures; for, by the annual payment at Rome of an ounce of gold, they might obtain exemption." "The abbots," says that archbishop, "exalt themselves above their primates and bishops; and not a man of them is willing to pay due regard to his superior. Thus abbots and monks would abandon themselves to all their lusts, with none to remind them of their duty, and every species of disorder would spread through the

[1] See page 152.

[2] Ep. 65.

[3] Latiniacensis abbas et monachi ejus, qui nescio qua nova libertate suos excessus tuentur, et subjectionem Parisiensi ecclesiae debitam et hactenus exhibitam contra canonicam institutionem de cervice sua excutere moliuntur. Hae autem personae hujusmodi sunt, quibus magis necessaria est subjectio quam libertas, qui libertate in occasionem carnis abutuntur, quibus si decem millia paedagogorum in Christo ad custodiam deputarentur, vix tamen sic regularis continentiae legibus ligarentur.

[4] Ep. 68. Among the letters of Peter of Blois.

monasteries.[1] If a speedy remedy were not applied to this evil, it was to be feared, that as the abbots were exempted from the oversight of the bishops, so the bishops would be exempted from that of the archbishops, and the deans and arch-deacons from that of their superiors." "To express our own opinion freely," says he, "it does little honor to the pope's justice, for him to confer a benefit on one person at the cost of another; to take what is mine, and render himself chargeable with doing, in ecclesiastical affairs, that which no secular power would take the liberty of doing in secular affairs." He reminds him, as Bernard had reminded pope Eugene,[2] of the precept of the apostle Paul (Rom. 13 : 1), that every man should be subject to the powers that be. "In the human body, one member does not decline serving another. Among the angels, *one* desired exemption from the divine authority; and, from an angel, he became a devil." He acknowledges, that such exemptions had been originally granted to the monasteries to secure quiet for them, to protect them against the tyranny of bishops; but the matter had now taken an opposite turn. Many were at the present time brought to ruin by these extraordinary liberties. To be sure, one who so firmly resisted the arbitrary proceedings of Rome, would necessarily draw upon himself the charge of presumption, for daring to attack the sacred authority of the pope.[3] Peter of Blois congratulates his brother, an abbot, who had received from the pope those badges of the episcopal dignity, together with the exemption, on the promotion he had obtained; but at the same time expresses his dissatisfaction that he should consent to wear the signs of a dignity which belonged only to the bishop, and which, on another functionary, savored of vanity and arrogance.[4] He tells him that disobedience to his lawful superior was not to be excused, even by the papal privilegium; for a privilege bestowed by a man could avail nothing against the divine order.[5] That pious theologian of Paris, who was so zealous in opposing the abuses of the church, near the close of the twelfth century, Peter Cantor, expresses a fear that such partial exemptions and partitions, would pave the way for the universal downfall of the spiritual empire of Rome, which was to take place in the last times.[6] It is singular, however, at the same time, to observe how this man, otherwise so liberal-minded,— in intimating, that

[1] Abbates exterius curam carnis in desideriis agunt, non curantes, dummodo laute exhibeantur, et fiat pax in diebus, eorum claustrales vero tanquam acephali otio vacant et vaniloquio, nec enim praesidem habent, qui eos ad frugem vitae melioris inclinet. Quodsi tumultuosas eorum contentiones audiretis, claustrum non multum differre putaretis a foro.

[2] See above, page 160.

[3] De facto summi pontificis disputasse et sacrilegium commisisse dicemur; verumtamen non est aequa disputatio, ubi sustinenti respondere non licet.

[4] Insignia episcopalis eminentiae in abbate nec approbo nec accepto. Mitra enim et annulus atque sandalia in alio quam in episcopo quaedam superba elatio est et praesumtuosa ostentatio libertatis. Ep. 90.

[5] Nec blandiatur sibi aliquis, quod per privilegium Romanae ecclesiae ab inobedientia excusetur. Si enim praecipit Deus et aliud indulget et praecipit homo, obediendum est Deo potius quam homini.

[6] Verendum est, ne hae exemptiones et divisiones particulares universalem faciant divisionem a Romano regno spirituali, quae facta est jam ex parte a Romano regno materiali. 2 Thess. 2 : 3. See Petri Cantoris verbum abbreviatum. Montibus, 1639, p. 114.

by such a mode of procedure the whole ancient constitution of the church was overthrown, and everything made solely and directly dependent on the supreme authority of the pope, — yet, at the same time, feels constrained to defend himself against the charge of violating the papal majesty; declaring that, beyond a doubt, no person was competent to judge over the pope, and that the apostolical chair, which could not err, may perhaps have acted in such things by a particular illumination. We might be almost tempted to regard such declarations as irony, if the whole tone of the work, and of the passage in question, did not contradict such a supposition.[1]

In France, some after-effects of that spirit of church freedom, which we observed there in the earlier centuries, still manifested themselves in the way in which the church of this country sought to preserve itself by the so called *pragmatic sanction*, enacted by king Louis the Ninth, in the year 1268, against several of the oppressive and restrictive measures which have just been mentioned.

The change which had taken place in the supreme government of the church, necessarily brought along with it a change also in many things connected with legislation, in all parts of the church; and hence, the old collections of ecclesiastical laws no longer met the existing wants. Ever since the pseudo-Isidorian decretals began to be received as valid, men would already come to be sensible of this. The collision between the old and the new church legislation would occasion considerable embarrassment. Since the establishment of the validity of those decretals, several new collections of ecclesiastical laws had, it is true, been formed; as, for example, that of Regino, abbot of Prüm, in the tenth, and that of Burkhard, bishop of Worms, and that of Yves, bishop of Chartres, in the eleventh century; but still, these collections did not prove adequate to do away that contrariety. Add to this, that the new papal church system needed some counterpoise against a tendency which threatened to become dangerous to it. In the twelfth century, great enthusiasm was excited for the renewed study of the Roman law, by the famous Irnerius (Guarnerius), at the university of Bologna; and this study led to investigations and doctrines which were quite unfavorable to the interests of the papacy. Even Irnerius stood forth as an ally of the imperial power, in the contest with the papacy,[2] and it was, in fact, the famous teachers of law at that university, who were employed by the emperor Frederic the First, to investigate and defend his rights at the diet of Roncala. The more eager, therefore, would be the hierarchical party

[1] Sed dicetur mihi, Ps. 72. Os tuum ponis in coelum. Respondeo: non. Hoc autem non asserendo, sed opponendo induco. Non enim licet mihi dicere domino papae: Cur ita facis? Sacrilegium enim est, opera ejus redarguere et vituperare. Verumtamen horum solutionem vel qua ratione iis obvietur, non video. Scio autem, quia auctoritate canonis veteris vel novi non fit hujusmodi divisio et exemptio in ecclesia sed speciali auctoritate sedis apostolicae, quam non patitur Dominus errare. Forte enim instinctu et familiari consilio Spiritus sancti legeque privata ducta hoc facit, sicut Sampson se cum hostibus occidit, sed sic sublati sunt consules et proconsules de medio, ut pauca vel nulla imperent et omnia Caesar sit, qui omnia sicut omnibus imperet.

[2] Landulph. Junior. hist. Mediolan. c. xxx. Muratori scriptor. rer. Italicar. t. v. f. 502.

to oppose that hostile tendency, by setting up another, in defence of their own interests and principles, through the study of ecclesiastical law, from an opposite point of view. Thus it came about that — at the famous seat itself of the study of the Roman law — at Bologna, about the year 1151, a Benedictine, or according to another account a Camaldulensian monk, Gratian, arranged a new collection of ecclesiastical laws, better suited to the wants of the church, and to the scientific taste of these times. As the title itself indicates, "*Concordia discordantium canonum*," old and new ecclesiastical laws were here brought together, their differences discussed, and their reconciliation attempted,— a method similar to that employed by Peter Lombard in handling the doctrines of faith. This logical arrangement and method of reconciliation, supplied a welcome nutriment to the prevailing scientific spirit. From that time the study also of canon law was pursued with great zeal, and the two parties called the Legists and the Decretists arose,— Gratian's collections of laws being denominated simply the "*Decretum Gratiani*." The zeal with which the study of civil and ecclesiastical law was pursued had however this injurious effect, that the clergy were thereby drawn away from the study of the Bible, and from the higher, directly theological, interest, and their whole life devoted solely to these pursuits.[1]

But still, the contrariety between the old and the new ecclesiastical laws could not be got rid of by this attempt at reconciliation. Many doubts and difficulties arose from this cause; and the popes were applied to for a decision of the contested questions which resulted therefrom. In the laws enacted by them, the ecclesiastical law received great additions; as, for example, in the decisions of Innocent the Third, in particular, which formed a rich storehouse for that code. But a twofold injury resulted. An intermediate authority was wanting, to introduce the new papal laws at once into the practice of the church; and, in the twelfth century, many bulls were interpolated, under the name of the popes, to subserve particular interests. People returning from a pilgrimage to Rome, brought with them interpolated bulls, and put them in circulation.[2] In the time of Innocent the Third, a forger of this sort had the boldness to appear in Sweden, in the character of a papal legate.[3] There were ecclesiastics who had acquired a peculiar knack in imitating papal bulls, and pushed a lucrative business in that line.[4] Thus many bad things could be done in the name of the popes, for which they were not in the least responsible, — an evil of which Innocent the Third felt it necessary to complain.[5] In England, near the close of the twelfth century, the ban

[1] Peter Cantor complains in his Verbum abbreviatum, c. li: Omissis artibus liberalibus coelestibusque disciplinis omnes codicem legunt et forensia quaerunt, ut gloriam et lucrum mendicent. Compare, in the letters of Peter de Blois, epistles 76 and 140.

[2] Innocent the Third, epp. l. ii, ep. 29.

[3] L. c. l. vi, ep. 10.

[4] Jacob of Vitry (see ante, page 60), names among the bad monks and clergy, who took all sorts of liberty to gratify their cupidity, those qui falsariorum crimen pessimum incurrentes, falsis literis et bullis furtivis in perditionem uti non verentur. Hist. occidental, c. xxix.

[5] Innocent III. (l. i, ep. 235) says: Dura saepe mandata et institutiones interdum

was for this reason publicly pronounced on falsifiers of the bulls.[1] In order to suppress these pernicious acts of imposture, Innocent the Third enacted laws, whereby such impostors were condemned to severe punishments, and the marks of distinction between genuine and ungenuine bulls accurately defined.[2] Hence, the still greater need of a new and duly accredited collection for ecclesiastical law, in which the genuine laws might be found brought together. After many previous attempts to supply this want, pope Gregory the Ninth, in the year 1234, caused such a digest to be formed by the general of the Dominicans, Raymund à Pennaforte.[3]

REMAINING PARTS OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

It was by the degeneracy of the clergy and the confusion existing in all parts of the church-constitution, that the reforming tendencies of the Hildebrandian epoch had been called forth. A part of the abuses which had crept in, those which the rude arbitrary proceedings of monarchs had introduced, were very thoroughly counteracted by the triumph of the Hildebrandian system; a great zeal for the reformation of the clergy and of the church life, after the pattern of the primitive apostolical church, as it presented itself to the imagination of the men of this period, commenced from this epoch. A bond of union was here presented between all the opponents of the reigning corruption, all men in all the churches who were zealous for a strict severity of morals among the clergy, and the worthy celebration of the offices of worship. The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg represents, as a work of the same spirit, the enthusiasm for the crusades; the zeal of monasticism now carried to an unusual height, and for the renovated canonical mode of living together; the multitudes who contended with secular, and the other multitudes who contended with spiritual weapons for the same holy object.[4] From this epoch began

iniquas a sede apostolica emanare multi arguunt et mirantur et in hoc ei culpam imponunt, in quo sinceritas ejus culpae prorsus ignara per innocentiam excusatur.

[1] Letters of Peter de Blois, ep. 53. It is here said, in an ordinance issued by Richard, archbishop of Canterbury: Quoniam in his partibus publica falsariorum pestis obrepsit, qui bullis adulterinis et literis calumnias innocentibus movent et statum juste possidentium subvertere moliuntur. And ep. 68: Falsariorum praestigiosa malitia ita in episcoporum contumeliam se armavit, ut falsitas in omnium fere monasteriorum exemptione praevaleat. In the letters of John of Salisbury, ep. 83: Hujus sigilli corruptio universalis ecclesiae periculum est, cum ad unius signaculi notam solvi et claudi possint quorumlibet ora pontificum et culpa quaelibet impunita pertranseat et innocentia condemnetur. Unde in eos, qui hoc attentare praesumunt, animadvertendum est sicut in hostes publicos et totius ecclesiae, quantum in ipsis est, subversores. On the traffic pursued with these forgeries, see, among the letters of Stephen of Tournay, ep. 221.

[2] Epp. l. i, ep. 235 and 349, and the other epistles of this pope already referred to.

[3] Decretalium, libri v.; the Decretals, simply so called.

[4] He says: Est grande spectaculum, videre hinc milites in campo pugnantes duce Josua, hinc vero beatum Augustinum quasi alterum Aron stipatum Levitis et sanctum Benedictum quasi Hur, Exod. 17. 12, stipatum religiosis monachis orantes;—and again: Hinc post longam simoniae hiemem vernali suavitate spirante reflorescit vinea Dominica, constituuntur coenobia et xenodochia et nova crebrescunt laudum cantica. In Ps. 39. Pez thesaurus anecdotor. novissimus, t. v, f. 794.

a fierce struggle between the smaller number of the more strict ecclesiastics who were disposed to favor reform, and the great majority who followed only their pleasures.

But the measures applied by Gregory the Seventh and his successors, were by no means calculated to produce a lasting effect on the vast multitude who were not themselves affected by this spirit of reform. By laws of celibacy, chastity and purity of manners could not be forced on the clergy: men contented themselves with a seeming obedience, and those to whom a regular marriage was not allowed, abandoned themselves, in private, to excesses so much the worse,—sought in gorgeous apparel, outward splendor,[1] revelry, and noisy amusements, an indemnification for the enjoyments of domestic life, which were forbidden them. The dissolution of the canonical life continually went on increasing. The prebends were by many considered as only a means of good living, and they either did not concern themselves at all about the ecclesiastical functions incumbent on them, or performed them in a mechanical way, without devotion or dignity, or else got them performed by hireling[2] job-working *substitutes*.[3] Those who would not follow the example of the rest, who exhibited in their whole manner of life a seriousness corresponding to their vocation, who dared to converse about spiritual things, were decried by the latter as singular fellows and pietists;[4] or, if they ventured to stand forth as censors, exposed themselves to hatred and persecution; for men dreaded a spirit of reform supported by popes and monarchs which might bring down a severe chastisement on the heads of the corrupt clergy. "Behold," said the others, "how this man departs from our customs; he wants to convert us into monks. We must at once take our stand against him. If we do not, it will go with us as it has done with others before us. The pope and the king will unite against us, they will deprive us of our livings, and other fashions will be introduced here. We shall become a laughing-stock to all the people."[5]

When the popes had succeeded in banishing the direct and arbitrary influence of the princes on ecclesiastical appointments, another not

[1] In opposition to these, see, e. g. the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, ep. 2, § 11: Conceditur tibi, ut si bene deservis, de altario vivas, non autem, ut de altario luxurieris, ut de altario superbias, ut inde compares tibi frena aurea, sellas depictas, calcaria deargentata, varia griseaque pellicea a collo et manibus ornatu purpureo diversificata.

[2] We have an example in a church at Gubbio in the twelfth century, in the account of the life of bishop Ubald, written by his successor Tebald: Nulla tunc temporis ordinis observantia, nulla prorsus religionis colebatur memoria. Mercede annua erat conductus, qui campanas pulsaret in hora officiorum et quia clericorum unusquisque in domo propria epulabatur et dormiebat, tota fere observantia ecclesiastici cultus custodiebatur in pulsu nolarum. — See Acta Sanctor. Mens. Maj. t. iii, f. 631.

[3] Clerici conductores and conductitii, as Gerhoh says in his Dialog. de differentia clerici saecularis et regularis. Pez thes. anecd. noviss. t. ii, f. 482.

[4] Si non faoio, quod caeteri, de singularitate notabor. Bernard. ep. 2, § 11.

[5] See Life of the abbot William Roskild, who belonged to the times of pope Innocent the Third, in the Actis Sanctor. M. April, t. i, f. 625; and what Jacob of Vitry says of those corrupt ecclesiastics: Hi autem, qui inter eos viri justi et timorati super abominationibus eorum lugent et contristantur, ab iis irridentur. Hypocritas et superstitiosos dicunt, reputantes pro magno crimine, quod divinae scripturae verbum vel ipsum Dei nomen inter eos ausi sunt nominare. Hist. occidental. c. xxx

less pernicious mode of arbitrary proceeding often took the place of that which had been suppressed. The bishops and chapters of the cathedral often suffered themselves to be determined by family interests and worldly considerations more than by any concern for the good of the church. The older ecclesiastical laws respecting the canonical age were neglected, and boys under age promoted to the first offices of the church.[1] Canonical priests made it a rule amongst themselves, that none but persons of noble birth should join their class,[2] and so the ostentatious display and luxurious modes of living practised in the higher ranks, were introduced amongst the clergy. Nepotism, and the spirit of gain, led to the accumulation of several benefices often involving the duties of incompatible callings on one person. Respecting the so-called plurality of benefices, and the non-residence of clergymen near the church with which their official duties were connected, various complaints were offered. Peter Cantor, in the work wherein he combats the ecclesiastical abuses of his times,[3] resents it that, in a respectable church, the five offices of greatest income had been given to absentees.[4] The popes Alexander the Third and Innocent the Third, passed laws at the Lateran general councils, in the years 1179 and 1215, for the suppression of the above-mentioned abuses; but, by all the outward measures that were applied, little could be effected, so long as the sources of the evil were still left behind; and the bad example which the arbitrary proceedings of succeeding popes presented, would only contribute to promote such abuses. Bishops, who had the good of their communities at heart, as, for example, Robert Grosshead, we hear complaining bitterly on this subject.[5]

In the contest with the great mass of the secularized clergy stood forth, in the twelfth century, men who sought to bring back the old canonical life to a still greater degree of strictness, to reform the clerical body still more according to the pattern of the monastic life.

[1] The words of Bernard in his tract, De officio episcoporum, c. vii: Scholares pueri et impuberes adolescentes ob sanguinis dignitatem promoventur ad ecclesiasticas dignitates et de sub ferula transferuntur ad principandum presbyteris, laetiores interim, quod virgas evaserint quam quod meruerint principatum. The complaints in Peter de Blois, ep. 60: Episcoporum nequitia, qui circa parentum promotionem sunt adeo singulariter occupati, ut nihil aliud affectent aut sommient, atque indigentiam scholarium vel in modica visitatione non relevent. Purpurata incendit parentela pontificum et elata de patrimonio crucifixi in superbia et in abusione ad omnes vitae saecularis illecebras se effundit.

[2] See e. g. Yve's letters, ep. 126.

[3] The Verbum Abbreviatum, already several times referred to.

[4] Pro quibus (reditibus) perceptis in ea nec per vicarium nec per alium servitur. Non dico, non cantatur, non legitur tantum, sed nec etiam consiliis ejus assistitur, quippe nulla personarum quinque semel in anno praesens in ea invenitur. l. c. c. xxxiv.

[5] See his letter to his archdeacon, ep. 107, in Brown, in which he calls upon him to exercise severity towards the clergy who neglected their duty, and complains of their incontinent lives, their worldly pursuits, and their trifling amusements: Ex relatu fide digno audivimus, quod plurimi sacerdotes archidiaconatus vestri horas canonicas aut non dicunt aut corrupte dicunt, et id quod dicunt sine omni devotione aut devotionis signo, imo magis cum evidenti ostensione animi indevoti dicunt nec horam observant in dicendo, quae commodior sit parochianis ad audiendum divina sed quae eorum plus consonat libidinosae desidiae. Habent insuper suas focarias, quod etsi nos et nostros lateat cum inquisitiones super ejusmodi fieri fecimus, his per quos fiunt inquisitiones perjuria non timentibus, non debet tamen vos sic latere.

Such a man was Norbert, the founder of a new and peculiar congregation, which became a place of refuge for many who were dissatisfied with the then existing condition of the clergy. Of him we shall have to speak more at large in the history of monasticism. But there were also other men of the more rigid tendency, who professed no wish of founding a new institution, but only desired to bring back the clergy to a mode of life and of association corresponding to their original destination. Among these the individual of whom we have so often spoken as an enthusiastic champion of the Hildebrandian system, the provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg, deserves particularly to be mentioned. The greatest part of his life was spent in struggling for the reformation of the *clerus*;[1] and the storms which agitated that body proceeded from this very cause; he is in this respect to be compared with Ratherius.[2] The apostolical community of goods, as men conceived it, was to him the type of the union which ought to exist amongst the clergy. The rule ascribed to Augustin, he represented as the law for the community of the clergy; they should own no sort of property; strangers to all luxury and splendor, they should be contented with the simple necessaries of life. It was what Arnold of Brescia wanted to bring about, only in a more liberal spirit. To the clerical rule drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle,[3] Gerhoh referred back, as a lax rule, originating in the court of a prince, not in the church.[4] Considered from this point of view, those ecclesiastics alone, who subjected themselves to this stricter rule, were recognized as genuine canonicals, as *clerici regulares;* all the rest were placed in the class of *irregulares saeculares*, secular clergymen. But among the latter, too, there was a great diversity as to their habits of living. This, even the zealous advocate of the stricter rule, the provost Gerhoh, little as he was inclined to allow them due justice, was forced to acknowledge.[5] There were amongst the secular clergy men of spiritual feelings; and a distinction is to be made between those whom the love of freedom, and those whom an inclination to licentiousness led to choose this mode of life; of which latter Jacob of Vitry says, that they were very properly called *canonici saeculares*, because they belonged entirely to the *saeculum*, to the world, but that they were incorrectly styled *canonici*, for they led a life altogether without rule or law.[6]

It so happened in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that, from the body of these secular clergymen, came individuals awakened to repentance by peculiar impressions upon their minds; filled with abhorrence of the worldly pursuits of the clergy, they turned all at once to

[1] He has himself related the history of his contests with bishops, canonicals, and princes, in his Commentary on the Psalms. See Pez thes. anecd. noviss. t. v, f. 2039.

[2] Vol. iii, p. 410.

[3] Vol. iii, p. 416.

[4] Illam clericorum regulam, non in ecclesia, sed in aula regis dictatam. In Ps. 67. Pez thes. t. v. f. 1352.

[5] He says: Non eos omnes damnamus, cum ex ipsis agnoscamus aliquos, licet paucos, esse ita disciplinatos, ut licet habeant propria, quasi non habentes, habeant ea et studeant in sectanda morum disciplina. In Ps. 67, l. c. f. 1353.

[6] From that better class he distinguishes these: Multi autem temporibus istis reperiuntur canonici vero nomine saeculares, quorum regula est, irregulariter vivere c. xxx.

an entirely different mode of life. The duties of the spiritual calling, their guilt in having hitherto so neglected them, pressed with their whole weight upon their consciences. They felt constrained to exert themselves the more earnestly to make good their own deficiencies, and to exhort clergy and laity to repentance and to a serious Christian deportment. They travelled round as preachers of repentance; by their words of exhortation, coming warm from the heart, many were moved, awakened to remorse for their sins and to resolutions of amendment; though the powerful impressions of the moment did not always endure. A circle of young men was formed around them, and they became the objects of enthusiastic veneration; by which, however, such of them as lacked firmness of Christian character might easily be intoxicated, and, quitting the paths of humility and discretion, be led into dangerous self-delusions; so that what had begun in a holy enthusiasm might gradually become vitiated by the intrusion of impure motives.

Near the close of the twelfth century, a great stir was produced in France by a person named Fulco. He was one of the ordinary, ignorant, worldly-minded ecclesiastics, the priest and parson of a country town not far from Paris. Afterwards, he experienced a change, of the nature we have described; and as he had before neglected his flock, and injured them by his bad example, so now he sought to build them up, by his teaching and example. But he soon became painfully sensible of his want of that knowledge which he had taken no pains to acquire, but which was now indispensable to him in order to instruct his community. In order to supply as far as possible this deficiency, he went on week-days to Paris, and attended the lectures of Peter Cantor, a theologian distinguished for his peculiar scriptural bent and his tendency to practical reform; and of the knowledge here acquired he availed himself, by elaborating it into sermons, which he preached on Sundays to his flock. These sermons were not so much distinguished for profoundness of thought, as for their adaptation to the common understanding and to the occasions of practical life. He was a man of the people, and the way in which he spoke made what he said still more impressive than it would otherwise have been. Hence, when others delivered his copied discourses over again, they failed of producing the same effects.[1] At first, neighboring clergymen invited him to preach before their congregations. Next, he was called to Paris, and he preached not only in churches, but also in the public places. Professors, students, people of all ranks and classes, flocked to hear him. In a coarse cowl, girt about with a thong of leather, he itinerated as a preacher of repentance through France, and fearlessly denounced the reigning vices, before learned and unlearned, high and low. His words often wrought such deep compunction, that people scourged themselves, threw themselves on the ground before him, confessed their sins before all, and declared themselves ready to do anything he might direct in order to reform their lives, and to redress the wrongs

[1] See the words of Jacob of Vitry: Quae tamen non ita sapiebant in alterius ore nec tantum fructificabant ab aliis praedicata. Hist. occidental. p. 287.

which they had done. Usurers restored back the interest they had taken; those who, in times of scarcity, had stored up large quantities of grain to sell again at a greatly advanced price, threw open their granaries. In such times he frequently exclaimed: "Give food to him who is perishing with hunger, or else thou perishest thyself." He announced to the corn-dealers that before the coming harvest they would be forced to sell cheap their stored-up grain; and cheap it soon became, in consequence of his own annunciation. Multitudes of abandoned women, who lived on the wages of sin, were converted by him. For some he obtained husbands; for others he founded a nunnery. He exposed the impure morals of the clergy; and the latter, seeing the finger of every man pointed against them, were obliged to separate from their concubines. A curse, that fell from his lips, spread alarm like a thunderbolt. People whom he so addressed were seen to fall like epileptics, foaming at the mouth and distorted with convulsions. Such appearances promoted the faith in the supernatural power of his words. Sick persons were brought to him from all quarters, who expected to be healed by his touch, by his blessing; and wonderful stories were told of the miracles thus wrought.[1] Men were so eager to obtain a fragment of his clothing, in order to preserve it as a miracle-working relic, that the very garments he wore on his person were often rent in pieces by the multitude. It required strong qualities of mind for a man not to be hurried by such extravagant veneration paid to himself, into self-forgetfulness and spiritual pride. Pressed by the multitude, in danger of being crushed, Fulco would swing his staff with such violence around him as to wound many within its sweep. But the wounded never uttered a murmuring word; they kissed the blood as it streamed forth under the blow, as if they had been healed by the rough touch of the holy man. A person having once rent a fragment from his garment, said he to the multitude: "Tear not my apparel which has not been blessed," and signing the cross, he pronounced a blessing on the raiment of the individual who had torn the fragment from his own, and this was now immediately divided up into small pieces, which were looked upon as relics. At length, he stood forth as a preacher of the crusades. A great deal of money was sent to him, which he divided amongst the crusaders; yet the vast collections which he made injured his reputation.[2]

The personal influence of this man, who stood prominent neither by his talents nor his official station, gave birth to a new life of the clergy, a greater zeal in discharging the duties of the predicatorial office and of the cure of souls, both in France and in England. Young men, who, in the study of a dialectic theology at the University of Paris, had forgotten the obligation to care for the salvation of souls, were touched

[1] Deserving of notice are the words of Jacob of Vitry: Tanta infirmorum et eorum, qui eos afferebant, erat fides et devotio, quod non solum servi Dei meritis, sed *fervore spiritus et fidei non haesitantis magnitudine* plures sanarentur.

[2] Jacobus de Vitriaco hist. occidental. c. vi. etc.; where we find the story related in full. Rigord, de gestis Philippi Augusti at the year 1195, and the following. Mat thew of Paris, year 1197, f. 160.

by the discourses of this unlearned itinerant, and trained by his instrumentality into zealous preachers. He formed, and left behind him, a peculiar school; he sent his disciples over to England, and his example had a stimulating effect even on such as had never come into personal contact with him. "Many," says Jacob of Vitry,[1] "inflamed with the fire of love, and incited by his example, began to teach and to preach, and to lead not a few to repentance, and to snatch the souls of sinners from destruction."

One man of learning, in particular, belonging to the University of Paris, the magister Peter de Rusia (or de Rossiaco), attached himself, as a preacher of repentance, to Fulco, and produced great effects. But his preaching procured for him rich presents and great marks of honor; he proved unfaithful to his missionary calling by accepting a place as canonical priest and chancellor of the church at Chartres. Such a change in this man made an unfavorable impression on those who were accustomed to reverence in Fulco's disciples only preachers glowing with love for the salvation of the souls of their brethren. An historian of these times remarks, in speaking of the great activity of the above-mentioned preacher, "He who would know in what temper each man preached, must look to the end; for the end most clearly reveals the disposition of the man."[2]

These preachers of repentance and reform, who came forth from the very body of the clergy, might be led on by their pious zeal to examine into the grounds and causes of the corruption which they attacked, and to inquire more profoundly into the gospel truth which was opposed to it. In this way a class of men might be raised up who would attack the reigning church system, as we shall see in the fourth section, relating to the history of sects.

We must here repeat what we have already said in an earlier period, concerning the exactions and tyranny of the archdeacons,[3] who endeavored to build up an authority independent of the bishops;[4] although there were those, too, who distinguished themselves by self-denying love in a devoted and assiduous discharge of the duties of their calling, by unwearied zeal and disinterestedness in making their tours of visitation amongst the communities intrusted to their care; men who expended their regular incomes in works of beneficence, and who remained poor in very profitable offices; men who, staff in hand, travelled over their dioceses on foot, preaching the word in every place.[5] To oppose, however, the arbitrary proceedings of those archdeacons who abused their authority, the bishops, in the course of the

[1] Hist. occidental. c. ix.

[2] Sed qui scire desiderat, qua intentione quisque praedicavit, finem attendat, quia finis intentionem hominum manifestissime declarat. Rigord de gestis Philippi ad a 1198.

[3] Vol. iii, p. 111.

[4] E. g. John of Salisbury, ep. 80, concerning the rabies archidiaconorum: Aliorum tristitia in eorum gaudium cedit, in quorum manibus iniquitates sunt, et sinistra eorum aut repleta est muneribus aut inhiat. Haec enim hominum monstra dextras non habent. Sicut enim quidam in virtutis exercitio ambidextri sunt, sic isti ambilaevi convincuntur ab avaritia et rapina.

[5] As is related of an archdeacon, Mauritius, in the diocese of Troyes, near the beginning of the thirteenth century, by Thomas Cantipratenus, in his Bonum Universale, c. i, p. 6.

twelfth century, employed other proxies in the administration of their jurisdictions, under the name of *officiales*. This title was applied at first in a more general sense, to denote those who, under various relations, served as deputies and agents of the bishops, and had to manage[1] various kinds of business in their names.[2] Somewhat later, those who served as deputies of the bishops in the care of souls,[3] and in the proper spiritual jurisdiction,— such officers as Innocent the Third, at the fourth Lateran council, in 1215, ordered to be appointed for the benefit of the larger dioceses neglected by the worldly minded bishops,[4] — were distinguished under the name of *vicarii*, from the *officiales*, so called in the narrower sense, to whom was intrusted a coercive jurisdiction. But though a check was thus placed on the arbitrary authority which the archdeacons had arrogated to themselves, and the authority of the bishops preserved against encroachments, yet the communities gained nothing thereby. In place of the exactions, which the archdeacons had taken the liberty to make on their own score, came others of a different sort, which were practised by the officials, as the organs of the bishops, for the enriching of themselves; so that Peter of Blois, in the last times of the twelfth century, could call these officials by no better name than bishops' bloodsuckers;[5] and Peter Cantor complains that the bishops gave themselves but little concern about the men to whom they committed the care of souls, but looked more sharply after those officials in the more limited sense of the word, by whom their coffers were filled. From this, it was quite evident how little they loved the souls of men, and their Saviour and upper Shepherd; how much, on the other hand, they loved money.[6]

[1] As appertaining to the officium episcopi.

[2] On this point, a passage in the Verbum Abbreviatum of Peter Cantor is particularly weighty, c. xxiv. He distinguishes tria genera officialium: 1. confessor, cui episcopus vices suas in spiritualibus, in audiendis confessionibus et curandis animabus committit; 2. quaestor palatii sui, decanus, archipresbyter et hujusmodi, qui incrementis et profectibus causarum et negotiorum episcopi per fas et nefas invigilant; 3. praepositus ruralis primus. He designates as quaestor and praepositus, such as had to administer the coercive jurisdiction of the bishop, and who were afterwards called *officiales* in the stricter sense of the word.

[3] Those whom Peter Cantor designates with the title of *confessores*.

[4] Praecipimus tam in cathedralibus, quam in aliis conventualibus ecclesiis viros idoneos ordinari, quos episcopi possint coadjutores et cooperatores habere, non solum in praedicationis officio, verum etiam in audiendis confessionibus et poenitentiis injungendis ac caeteris, quae ad salutem pertinent animarum. c. x.

[5] Tota officialis intentio est, ut ad opus episcopi suae jurisdictioni commissas miserrimas oves quasi vice illius tondeat, emungat, excoriet. Isti sunt episcoporum sanguisugae. Ep. 25.

[6] I will, for the benefit of the learned reader, place here the entire passage which is so important a source for the history of these relations: Praepositus ruralis primus, licet Deo dignior, episcopo tamen est vilior. Cum isto ei est rarus sermo, rara consultatio super reddenda ratione villicationis suae, super regimine animarum, in quo patet, quantum amabat eas et redemptorem et summum pastorem earum. Cum tortore autem et praepositio frequens ei est sermo, ratiocinatio et consultatio. In quo patet, quantum dilexerit pecuniam. Sed et, quod detestabilius est, primum mittit ad officii sui executionem sine magna fidelitatis ejus examinatione praehabita, sine sacramento jurisjurandi de fidelitate ei servanda in regimine animarum interposito. Secundum autem et tertium discutit usque ad unguem, si bene noverint bursas pauperum emungere et cum asportato lucro ad Dominos suos redire, quibus tutelam pecuniae sine juramento interposito non committit. Horum autem duorum, scilicet quaestoris et praepositi, violentior est quaestor. Praepositus enim saepius poena certa et definita reum punit. Quaestor vero incerta et vo-

He pronounces it an abominable thing, that the places of such officials should be farmed out by the bishops for a stipulated sum of money; for these people practised every species of extortion in order to indemnify themselves for the sums they had advanced.[1]

The bishops, with the great powers bestowed on them, might be instruments of much good, or they might occasion a great deal of mischief. We find examples of both kinds; for along with the great majority of bad bishops, there was a choice set of very good ones, men profoundly penetrated with the spirit of genuine piety, and ready to offer themselves up in every way for the good of their communities. Among the qualities belonging to the exemplary discharge of the bishop's calling, were reckoned zeal in preaching, in caring for souls, and in making church-visitations; impartiality; the union of severity and gentleness in the trials conducted by him; inflexibility to the threats of power in administering punishment to the bad;[2] activity in providing for the poor and sick; burial of the poor; restoration of peace among contending parties. Peter, bishop of Moustier en Tarantaise, in Savoy, who administered this office from the year 1142 to 1175, performed all these duties with great diligence in a poor and mountainous diocese. He sought to bring it about that each church of his diocese might possess a silver cup for the communion. Where other means failed, he got an egg to be offered weekly from each house; these eggs he caused to be collected together and sold, till finally the necessary sum was obtained for purchasing a cup for the church where this was done. On his tours of visitation, he took but few companions with him, and those only such as, like himself, would seek to be as little burdensome as possible to the communities. He begged those who entertained him and his companions, to give all which they left untouched to his brethren the poor. His house always resembled a poorhouse, — as his biographer relates, — especially during the three months before harvest, when, amongst those barren rocks, the means of subsistence were most difficult to be obtained. A multitude flocked in daily, whom he supplied with bread and herbs, and every year he made a grand and general love-feast. He took pains to search out those who were too infirm to labor, those who were suffering under incurable disorders throughout his whole diocese, — or to cause them to be sought out by others whom he could trust, — and provided them with food and raiment. Those who had no dwellings, no relatives to care for them, he took care to place under the guardianship of faithful and pious persons, with whom they found everything necessary for their comfort. When, in rough winter weather, poor

luntaria, pro modica culpa maximam poenam infligens.

[1] Quod mirabilius est et execrabilius, illis quaesturam, torturam et exactionem et praelaturam vendit, ad pretium certum committit. Qui ne damnum et detrimentum propriae pecuniae incurrant, per omne nefas exactionum, calumniarum, rapinarum laxant retia sua in capturam pecuniarum, praedones effecti potius quam officiales

[2] Accordingly, it was said of such an one: Nihil ea in re nec minis principum nec tyrannorum saevitia absterritus. See, e. g. the life of William archbishop of Bourges, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, in the Actis Sanct. Mens. Januar. t. i, c. ii, and iii, f. 629.

people met him on the mountains, destitute of suitable clothing to protect them from the cold, he shared with them, in case of necessity, the raiment he wore on his own body. In those Alpine regions, where there were no houses to receive wandering travellers, as, for example, on Mount St. Bernard, on the Jura, and on a third mountain, unnamed, he caused such shelters to be erected at his own expense, and took care that every pains should be taken to make them solid and durable. Wherever it was necessary to preach before the better-educated, he turned the duty on others; but he made it a special object of attention himself, to preach intelligibly to the common people. He was wont to apply to himself the words of the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 14: 19: "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." Being a zealous adherent of Alexander the Third, he had to oppose the emperor Frederic the First, in the contested papal election; yet this monarch, who looked with contempt on the clergy that were surrounded with worldly pomp and splendor, felt constrained to honor and spare a spiritual shepherd like him.[1]

We have already, on several occasions, remarked of the German bishops, that by their political position, as important members of the empire, they became entangled in a great deal of business foreign to their spiritual office as shepherds, so as to be drawn off by secular affairs from the proper duties of their calling.[2] Gerhoh of Reichersberg looked upon it as a grave violation of the ecclesiastical laws, that bishops should plan campaigns,—deliberate with monarchs on worldly affairs; especially, that they should assist at capital trials. He called it a wretched hypocrisy in these bishops when, in order to show an apparent respect for the ecclesiastical laws, they absented themselves a short time before the close of those bloody trials, after every arrangement had already been made for the sentence which was to be passed. "They do like the Jews," says he, "who declared before Pilate, 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,'" John 18: 31,—meaning that the Roman soldiers should crucify Christ.[3] According to *his* view of the church theocracy, the church should exercise only a *moral* oversight over secular affairs, contend only with the sword of the Spirit; and she would be irresistible, as he supposed, if she made use of this weapon alone. She enfeebled herself and her authority, when she laid aside the spiritual sword for the secular. Nor did he even spare the popes, whose example might be appealed to in justification of the bishops. Happening to meet pope Eugene the Third, who had returned for the last time to Rome, at Viterbo,—when that pope complained to him of the unfavorable treaty of peace, which after a large expenditure of money he had been obliged to con-

[1] Acta. Sanctor. Mens. Maj. t. ii, f. 324.

[2] The words of a Parisian ecclesiastic: "I can believe almost anything; but I can hardly believe that a German bishop will be saved." The reason stated is, that German bishops, almost without exception, bear the secular along with the spiritual sword; hold bloody courts; wage war, and feel more solicitude about the pay of their troops than the salvation of souls. See Caesar. Heisterbac. Dial. distinct. ii, c. xxvi Bibl. Cistere. t. ii, f. 44.

[3] De aedificio, c. xxxv, Pez. t. ii, p ii, f 359.

clude with the Romans,[1] — he remarked to him, that "even such a peace was better than the war carried on by him; for," said he, "when the pope prepares to make war with the aid of hireling soldiers, I seem to see Peter before me, drawing his sword from its sheath. But when he comes off the worst in such a contest, I think I hear the voice of Christ, saying to Peter, 'Put up thy sword in its sheath.'"[2]

As those German bishops must have felt themselves burdened by the duties of their double sphere of action, as their dioceses were of vast extent, and as secular business often occupied more of their time and thoughts than spiritual, so they would naturally welcome any opportunity that might offer itself of procuring such assistants as had received episcopal ordination, and were therefore in a condition to act as their substitutes in the performance of episcopal functions. This opportunity was presented to them by a peculiar train of events in the thirteenth century. When the successful issue of the first crusades, and the conquest of Constantinople, had extended the empire of the Western church in the East, the popes proceeded to erect bishoprics in those countries. But with the loss of those possessions, the bishoprics also had to be abandoned. Yet the popes would not relinquish their claims to them; but still continued to appoint and consecrate bishops for those lost churches; though in reality they were bishops only in name (*episcopi in partibus infidelium*). Now, in these titular bishops, the German prelates found the very kind of help which they wanted. These ecclesiastics were sent to them as *coadjutores*, suffragan bishops (*suffraganei*); and as pious men were frequently appointed to those places from the Dominican and Franciscan orders, so the arrangement operated advantageously for the cause of religious instruction and the care of souls in those German dioceses.

IV. Prophetic Warnings against the Secularization of the Church.

The church having arrived at the summit of power, the conviction continually gained force on the minds of men, that the superfluity of earthly goods would work ruin to the church itself; that through this secularizing spirit she was becoming estranged from her true calling. The complaints of the Hohenstaufen emperors, and of an entire party which attached itself to them;[3] the voices of the German national

[1] See ante, p. 157.

[2] See Gerhoh's letter to pope Alexander the Third, published by Pez Thes. anecdot. noviss. t. v, f. 540.

[3] The Gottfried of Viterbo mentioned on page 172, speaking of Constantine's donation to Silvester, says: Ego autem, ut de sensu meo loquar, utrum Deo magis placeat gloria et exaltatio ecclesiae, quae hoc tempore est, aut humilitatio, quae primitus fuerat, confiteor me ignorare. *Videtur multis quidem primus ille status sanctior, iste felicior.* He does not venture to decide on the point, since Christ promised the church freedom from error. Caetera super his quaestionibus, majoribus nostris solvenda relinquimus. Pantheon. p. xvi, in Muratori script rerum Italicar. f. 361.

bards,[1] and of the prophets that rose up to oppose the corruption of the church, as well as of the sects that contended against her; all were agreed in attributing her degeneracy to the riches that had been lavished on her. A certain faculty of prophecy seems implanted in the spirit of humanity; the longing heart goes forth to meet beforehand great and new creations, which it needs in order to the attainment of its objects; undefined presentiments hasten to anticipate the mighty future. Especially does the kingdom of God, in the course of its development from beginning to end, form a connected whole, and it strives towards its completion according to sure and certain laws. The germ of the unknown future is already contained in the past. The spirit of the kingdom of God begets, therefore, in those who are filled with it, a prophetic consciousness,—presentiments in reference to the grand whole of the evolution, which are different from the prediction of individual events, not necessarily connected with that whole. Although the appearance of Christ, as the great turning-point in man's history, would above all be necessarily preceded by prophecy and anticipation, yet, to the still further evolution of the kingdom of God, even after it has left its first envelopment, and come forth to the open light, belongs also a prophetic element; as many an important epoch and turning-point still remains to be unfolded in its history, till it arrives at the ultimate goal. Out of the consciousness of the corruption of the church sprang the presentiment of a future regeneration, for which the way must be prepared by some violent process of purification. To longing hearts, a contemplation of the corruption of the secularized church served as a sort of foil, enabling them to picture forth, by the rule of contraries, the image of the better future. Accordingly, we may recognize in phenomena of this kind, belonging to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, foretokens, —premonitions,—of the Reformation; and perhaps, also, of epochs of development lying still more remote. Not the Christian spirit alone, however, but the antichristian also, has its divination. We see already budding forth, in antagonism with the false objectivity and externalization of the church, the tendency to a false inwardness and subjectivity; a tendency which aimed at, and predicted, the dissolution of everything positive in religion, and, consequently, the dissolution of Christianity itself; premonitions of a spiritual bent, which, after mining for centuries in the heart of European civilization, was destined finally to burst through all the established boundaries of its social order.

As representatives of the first-described direction of the prophetical spirit, we may mention the abbess Hildegard and the abbot Joachim. The predictions of the latter, however, were afterwards taken up by the second of the above-mentioned directions, and interpreted in ac-

[1] E. g. in Walter von der Vogelweide, the legend of the threefold woe, which the angels had announced at the donation made by Constantine to Silvester: "Once, Christianity was beautiful; a poison has now fallen on it; its honey has been turned to gall; great sorrow will come from this upon the world." Edition of Lachmann, p. 25.

cordance with its own sense. We will now proceed to take a nearer view of these two important personages.

Hildegard, who was born in 1098 and died in 1197,[1] founded, and presided as abbess over, the Rupert convent near Bingen. Her visions, which were held to be supernatural,— the revelations which she claimed herself to have received from Heaven,— her plain, frank, and moving exhortations, made her an object of great veneration. Especially after the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux,— while sojourning in Germany on the business of preaching the crusade,— and pope Eugene the Third, had both recognized the divinity of her mission, did she attain the highest summit of her reputation. Persons of all ranks applied to her for advice, for the disclosing of future events, for the decision of disputed questions, for her intercessions, and her spiritual consolations. Amongst those who consulted her were to be reckoned abbots and bishops, popes, kings, and emperors. If many complained of the obscurity of her sayings,[2] others might suppose they found a deeper wisdom in the darkness of the response. Parents longing to obtain children had recourse to the intercessions of Hildegard; and to such applications she replied: "This depends on the power and will of God, who alone knows to whom he grants children, and from whom he takes them away; for his judgment is not according to man's liking, but according to his own wisdom. Because you have besought me, I will beseech God for you; but let him do what, according to his grace and mercy, he has determined to do."[3] Many of her exhortations and responses betoken, on the whole, a Christian wisdom superior to the prejudices of her times. Pointing to the inward temper alone, as the important thing in Christian life, she declared herself opposed to all over-estimation of outward works, and all excessive asceticism. To an abbess she wrote, cautioning her against such delusion: "I have often observed that, when a man mortifies his body by extreme abstinence, a sort of disgust steals over him, and from this disgust he is more apt to plunge into vice than if he had allowed due nourishment to his body."[4] In the name of God, she gave to another this response: "What I have given man to eat, I do not take from him; but food that excites disgust I know not, for vanity goes with it. Believe not that by immoderate abstinence any soul can fly to me; but avoiding all extremes, let the man devote himself to me, and I will receive him."[5] To another much respected nun of this period, Elizabeth of Schönau, who also supposed herself favored with heavenly visions, she gave the following exhortation: "Let those who would do the work of God, be ever mindful that they are

[1] The collections on the history of their lives, in the Actis Sanctorum, 17th Sept.

[2] Thus we hear of an abbot Berthold: Licet consolationibus verborum vestrorum factus sum saepe laetior, obscuritatibus tamen eorum eo quod non plene intellectui meo paterent, factus sum tristior. Martene et Durand Collectio amplissima, t. ii, f. 1017.

[3] Martene et Durand Collectio ampl. t. ii, f. 1029. Ep. 11.

[4] Saepe video, quando homo per nimietatem abstinentiae corpus suum affligit, quod taedium in illo surgit, et taedio vitio se implicat, plus quam si illud juste pasceret. L. c. f. 1068.

[5] L. c. f. 1060.

earthen vessels, that they are men. Let them ever keep before their eyes what they now are, and what they shall be; and let them commit heavenly things to him who is in heaven, for they are themselves at a far distance from their home, and know not the things of heaven."[1] To an abbess, who begged an explanation of some anxiety by which she was troubled, she replied: "Thou shouldst hold fast to *the sacred Scriptures*, in which we come to the knowledge of God by faith. We should not tempt God, but reverentially adore him. Oftentimes, man impatiently desires from God a solution of some difficulty which it is not granted him to understand, and is thereby misled to forsake God's service. Give thyself no concern about thoughts rising up involuntarily in thy soul. Satan often shoots such arrows into man's heart, in order to create distrust of God. This should serve as an exercise for self-denial; everything depends on not giving way to such thoughts. Blessed is the man who by so doing *lives*, though constantly girt around, as it were, by the pains of death."[2] To an abbot, harassed by many inward conflicts, who applied to her for comfort and for her intercessions, she replied: "There is in thee a breath of God, to which God has communicated an endless life, and to which he has given the wings of reason. Rise, therefore, with them, through faith and pious aspirations, to God. Know him, as thy God, who knew thee first, and from whom thy being proceeds; therefore, beseech him that, by the breath of his Spirit, he would teach thee what is good, and deliver thee from evil. Trust in him, that thou mayest not be ashamed to appear before him with all thy works; and pray to him, as a son does to a father, when punished by him because he has erred, that he would remember his own child, in thee."[3] In the time of the schism between pope Alexander the Third and Victor the Fourth, a certain abbot applied among others to Hildegard, to inform him what he ought to do, so long as it remained doubtful which was to be considered the true pope?[4] She advised him to say in his heart to God, "Lord, thou, who knowest all things, in my superiors I will obey thee, so long as they oblige me to do nothing contrary to the Catholic faith." He should place his hope in God alone, who would never forsake his church.[5] To an abbess, who applied to her for comfort, and for her intercessions, she wrote: "Abide in communion with *Christ;* seek all good *in him;* to him reveal thy works, and he will bestow on thee salvation; for without *him* salvation is sought in vain from man; for grace and salvation are attained, not through any man, but through God."[6] She boldly stood forth against the arbitrary will of an ambi-

[1] Hildegard. epistolae, page 115. Colon. 1566.

[2] Beatus homo, qui ea nec facere vult, nec eis consentit, sed sicut cum passione mortis in eis vivit. Martene et Durand Collectio ampl. t. ii, f. 1075.

[3] Martene et Durand Collectio ampl. t. ii, f. 1053.

[4] The abbot, speaking of the pernicious consequences of a schism of this sort, which every man would take advantage of as a pretext for disobedience, had said: Quoniam ecclesia, ad quod caput suum respiciat, veraciter ignorat, quia quisque vagus inde exemplum sumens religionem bonae conversationis abhorret, hi qui spiritu Dei aguntur, non minime sollicitantur, qui finis eorum in voluntate Dei esse debeat. L. c. f. 1055.

[5] Tu ergo spe tua ad unum Deum tende, quia ipse ecclesiam suam non derelinquet.

[6] L. c. f. 1058.

tious clergy. In the cemetery of her convent one was buried, who, it was said, had been excommunicated; but those who performed the obsequies maintained that he had obtained absolution. The spiritual authorities of Mayence caused the body to be dug up, and laid the convent under an interdict, because ecclesiastical burial had been granted to an excommunicated person. Hildegard, thereupon, issued a letter, addressed to the clergy of Mayence,[1] in which she represented to them how grievously they had sinned by such an arbitrary proceeding. "All prelates were bound to avoid taking a step, except after the most careful examination of reasons, which would prevent *any* community, by their sentence, from singing God's praise or administering and receiving the sacraments. They should be very certain, that they were moved to such a step only by zeal for God's justice, and not by anger or revenge." She assured them that she had heard a divine voice, saying: "Who created heaven? God. Who opens heaven to his faithful? God. Who is like unto him? No man."

The clergy, generally, she severely rebuked on account of their corrupt morals; their ambition and thirst for lucre; their unholy traffic with sacred things; their occupations, which were so utterly inconsistent with the spiritual calling,— such as bearing arms, singing ludicrous songs.[2] She reproaches them for neglecting, in their devotion to worldly pursuits, the peculiar duties of their calling,— the instruction of the people in God's law, offering the idle excuse that it cost too much labor.[3] They rendered themselves chargeable, by this neglect and by their bad example, with the guilt of ruining the laity, who lived according to their lusts; before whom they ought rather to shine as pillars of light. She announced to the clergy a divine judgment, which would deprive them of the riches that served to corrupt them; a judgment, from which the clergy was to come forth tried and refined. The then spreading sects of the Catharists and the Apostolici,[4] appeared to her the antetype of a party which would be used by the Almighty, as an instrument of this judgment for the purification of the church.[5] "A troop led astray, and commissioned by Satan, shall come, with pale countenances and all appearance of sanctity; and they shall combine with the mightier princes of the world. In mean apparel shall they go; full of meekness and of composure of mind shall they appear; by simulating the strictest abstinence and chastity, shall they draw after them a numerous train of followers; and to the princes shall they say, concerning you, Why tolerate these people among you, who pollute the whole earth with their sins? They

[1] Hildegard. epistolae, p. 121.

[2] L. c. p. 160, to the clergy in Cologne Interdum milites, interdum servi, interdum ludificantes cantores existitis; sed per fabulosa officia vestra muscas in aestate aliquando abigitis.

[3] Nec subditos doctrinam a vobis quaerere permittitis, dicentes; omnia elaborare non possumus.

[4] Of whom we shall speak in the fourth section.

[5] Per quendam errantem populum, pejorem erranti populo, qui nunc est, super vos praevaricatores ruina cadet, qui ubique vos persequetur et qui opera vestra non celabit, sed ea denudabit. L. c. p. 160.

live in drunkenness and revelling, and, unless you drive them forth, the whole church will go to destruction. These people shall be the rod which God will make use of to chastise you, and they shall continue to persecute you until you are purified from your sins. When this is done, then shall the princes discover the hypocritical character of these persecutors of the clergy, and fall upon them. Then shall the morning dawn of righteousness arise, and the clergy, purified by affliction, shine as the finest gold."[1]

The predictions of Hildegard were widely diffused and much read; and they gave matter for reflection on the nature of that process of purification which awaited a corrupted church. New prophetic visions were called forth by them.

Far more graphically depicted did the image of the future present itself in the soul of the abbot Joachim, who, at first, presided over the monastery at Corace (Curatium) in Calabria, at length founded the monastery of Floris, and a peculiar congregation of monks, and died between the years 1201 and 1202. He was reverenced in his time as a prophet, and stood in high consideration with popes and princes.[2] He was an enthusiastic friend of monasticism and of the contemplative life, from which he looked for the regeneration of the secularized church. He opposed the mystical to the scholastico-dialectic theology. As the reigning corruption seemed to him to spring from secularization and the fondness for dry and meagre conceptions of the understanding, so he expected from religious societies who should renounce all earthly goods,and live only in pious contemplation, a new and more glorious epoch of the church in the latter days. We must transport ourselves back to the times in which he lived. It was near the close of the twelfth century; the papacy had been seen to come forth victoriously out of the contest with the emperor Frederic the First; but new and violent storms might still be expected to burst from the side of that powerful house. The Calabrian regarded Germany with detestation; and he was inclined to look upon the imperial power of Germany as the one to be employed in executing judgment on a corrupted church; but neither could he forgive it in the popes that they had taken refuge in France. Grief over the corruption of the church, longing desire for better times, profound Christian feeling, a meditative mind, and a glowing imagination, such are the peculiar characteristics of his spirit and of his writings. His ideas were presented for the most part in the form of comments and meditations on the New Testament; but the language of the Bible furnished him only with such hints as might turn up for the matter which he laid into them by his allegorizing mode of interpretation; although the types, which he supposed he found presented in the Scriptures, reacted in giving shape to his intuitions. As his writings and ideas found great acceptance, in this age, among those who were dissatisfied with the present, and

[1] Hildegard. epistolae, p. 169.

[2] See the records and collections on the history of his life in the Actis Sanctor, 29th of May. Comp. Dr. Engelhardt's Essay, on the Abbot Joachim and the Everlasting Gospel, p. 32, in his Kirchengeschichtlichen Abhandlungen.

who were longing after a different condition of the church; and the Franciscans, who might easily fancy they discovered, even in that which is certainly genuine, in Joachim's writings, a prophecy referring to their order, so a strong temptation arose to the forging of works under his name, or the interpolating those which really proceeded from him. The loose connection of the matter in his works, made it easy to insert passages from other hands; and this character of the style renders a critical sifting of them difficult.[1]

Let us now consider, more in detail, what is expressed in these remarkable writings concerning the present and the future.

[1] The three works referred to by himself in the prologue to his Commentary on the Apocalypse, namely: *This* Commentary, the Concordiae Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, and the Psalterium decem Chordarum, are certainly genuine. In reference, however, to the Commentary on Jeremiah and Isaiah, my own opinion would be confirmatory of the suspicions expressed by Engelhardt. These books are not cited in the list given by Joachim himself, although the Commentary on Jeremiah purports to have been written in the year 1197, and the Commentary on the Apocalypse, to which the above-mentioned prologue belongs, was composed in the year 1200. Moreover, in the preface to his Psalterium decem Chordarum, he mentions only those three works as belonging to one whole. The prediction of two new orders of monks, who should appear for the glorification of the church in the last times, and which were supposed to be fulfilled in the Dominican and Franciscan orders, certainly does not warrant us to entertain the suspicion, at once, that they were of later origin; for the contemplative life of monasticism was assuredly regarded by the abbot Joachim as the highest of all; and a renovation of that mode of life could not but appear to him as one of the essential marks of the glory of the last age of the church. But then again, the idea of a double order of monks presented itself to him of its own accord, — of an order, whose labors in the way of preaching was to bring about the last general conversion of the nations; and an order which should represent the highest Johannean stage of the contemplative life. Thus, no doubt, it may be explained that, even without being a prophet, he might hit on the thought of sketching forth a picture of two such orders; since we find something like this in the writings which undoubtedly belong to him. But still, many descriptions of the Franciscans are too striking not to excite the suspicion that they have been foisted in by some Franciscan; as, for example, Commentar. in Jerem., p. 81, the *praedicatores* and the *ordo minorum;* and the way in which the author expresses himself in this place, makes it certainly more probable that the title *minores*, already existing, led him to the explications which there occur, than that he had been led by those explications so to designate this order of contemplatives. Next occur, particularly in the Commentary on Isaiah, as they do not in Joachim's undoubtedly genuine works, certain prophecies, which seem to have arisen *post factum*. Page seventh contains the remarkable passage concerning Amalric of Bena, Revelation, 9: 2, thus interpreted: Sive Almericus sive aliquis alius in Liguria doctor magnus fuerit, qui detexerit profundum scientiae saecularis, cum regio illa adeo infecerit erroribus circumpositas regiones, ut de hujusmodi locustis et lamiis ipsa mater ecclesia tabescat. Page 28, Col. 2, the predictions concerning the power of the Mongols; how the Tartars would turn their arms against the Mohammedans. To be sure, the spurious character of such single passages is no evidence of the spuriousness of the entire work, in which, moreover, the current ideas of Joachim may easily be discerned: and in the Commentary on Jeremiah, we also find many single passages which do not favor the hypothesis of its having been composed at some later period. Would a Franciscan, instead of referring all to the two mendicant orders, have so expressed himself as on page 85: In tertio vero statu retorquendum est totum ad Cisterciences et alios futuros religiosos, qui post antichristi ruinam multiplicandi sunt? Page 151, the successor of Celestin is compared with Herod the Great, and a persecution of the *spiritualis intelligentia*, proceeding from him, is predicted: Designat Herodes summum pontificem post Coelestinum futurum, quicunque sit ille. It is easy to see how Joachim, writing near the end of the reign of Celestin, might have been led by his typical expositions, flights of imagination, and his tone of character, to predict such things of Celestin's successor; but it is difficult to believe, that a man belonging to one of the two monkish orders, afterwards Innocent the Third, would be so designated.

In his commentary on the prophet Jeremiah,[1] Joachim complains of the exactions of the Roman church: "The whole world is polluted with this evil. There is no city nor village where the church does not push her benefices, collect her revenues. Everywhere she will have prebends, endless incomes. O God, how long dost thou delay to avenge the blood of the innocent, which cries to thee from beneath the altar of the Capitol?"[2] He calls the church of Rome[3] the house of the courtezan, where all practise simony, all are stained and polluted; where the door is thrown open to every one who knocks. He speaks against the legates, who travel about the provinces, impudently preach, acquire benefices and prebends, snatch to themselves the dignity of the prelates. He complains of the deification of the Roman church: "Some have so exalted the church in Rome," says he,[4] "that a man was held up as a heretic, who did not visit the threshold of Peter. Their guilty mistake lay in this, that they bid men visit the holy material temple, when the truth is, that in every place every Christian is a temple of God, if he leads a good life."[5] He speaks against indulgences dispensed from Rome: "Many place so much confidence in the absolution of the church, as never once to think that they need to leave off sinning; but sink deeper and deeper in all manner of wickedness." He is full of zeal against the proud and fleshly-living cardinals and prelates.[6] He predicts a divine judgment on the Roman curia, because litigious processes and exactions were worse in that court than in all other judicatories.[7] He announces that Christ is about to grasp the scourge, and drive sellers and buyers out of the temple. He does not stop with accusations against the church of Rome, but attacks also the prevailing corruption in all other parts of the church. "The church of Peter," says he, "the church of Christ, which was once full, is now empty: for, although she now seems full of people, yet they are not her people, but strangers. They are not her sons, the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, but the sons of Babylon. What profits the name of Christ, where the power is wanting? The church is, as it were, widowed: there are but few or no bishops, who, to save the flocks, expose themselves a prey to the wolves. Every man seeks his own, and not the things of Jesus Christ."[8] "Where," says he,[9] "is there more contention, more fraud, more vice and ambition than among the clergy of our Lord? Therefore must judgment begin from the house of the Lord, and the fire go forth from his sanctuary, to consume it, in order that the others may perceive what will be done with them, when he spares not even his sin-

[1] Page 61.

[2] A play on words: O Deus, quousque non vindicas sanguinem innocentum, sub altari clamantium Romani Capituli, immo Capitolii?

[3] Page 98.

[4] Page 108.

[5] Quia invitabant ad templum sanctum materiale arguuntur, quia in loco omni quilibet christianus templum Dei est, dummodo bonas faciat vias suas.

[6] Praelatos et cardinales superbe carnaliterque viventes. Comment. in Jerem. p. 262.

[7] Transscendit papale praetorium cunctas curias in calumniosis litibus et quaestibus extorquendis. Comment. in Esaiam, p. 39.

[8] De concordia novi et veteris testamenti, p. 54, therefore in a writing undoubtedly genuine.

[9] L. c. p. 53.

ning children." Of the Romish church, to which he frequently applies the name Babylon, he says, "She should not plume herself upon her faith, when she denies the Lord by her works."[1] He is fond of marking the course of history; particularly the history of the papacy. He describes pope Leo the Ninth as the representative of a reforming tendency in the church.[2] Pope Paschalis the Second he represents as the traitor of the church, who had reduced her to servitude.[3] He accuses the popes of conniving at wickedness in order to gain temporal advantages from princes, and of having made themselves slaves to princes, because they wished to rule by secular power. "After the popes began to contend with worldly princes, and to be intent on reigning over them by worldly pride, they have been obliged ever since the time of pope Paschalis to fall beneath them. Their successors, down to the present time, have sacrificed the liberties of the church to the German monarchs; and, for the sake of temporal things, have tolerated many an offence in the church of God. Because they perceived that the temporal things after which they lusted belonged to the Roman empire, they were willing rather to do homage for a while to secular princes, than to go against the stream."[4] "Although," says he,[5] "the secular princes have wrested many things by violence from the church, as for example the Kingdom of the Sicilies; and, although they hinder the freedom of the church, yet even the popes themselves have wrested many things from the princes, which they never should have longed after nor taken. And as every man seeks his own, force is met by force; the church attacks the state, the greedy prelates receive not the word of Christ, "Render unto Cesar, the things that are Cesar's;" thus the *old bottles will burst*, and the pope will not only long after temporal things, as belonging to him, but also after spiritual things, which do not belong to him (the sense is, he will arrogate to himself all spiritual authority, even that which does not belong to him). Thus will it come to pass, that he will seat himself in the temple of God, and, as a god, exalt himself above all that is called God, that is, above the authority of all prelates."[6] In the commentary on Isaiah, he remarks: "When the chair of Peter drew the temporal sword in compliance with a forbidden ambition, and exposed his sons, like cattle for the slaughter, to doubtful chances, he considered not what the Scriptures say, 'He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword.'[7] It is the incredulity of human weakness," says he,[8]

[1] In Jerem. p. 65.

[2] Ut ambularent in novitate spiritus in carne viventes.

[3] See above, p. 2, f. Compare also the commentary on the apocalypse, p. 7: In tempore ecclesiae quinto et maxime a diebus Henrici primi imperatoris Alamannorum mundani principes, qui christiani dicuntur, qui primo videbantur venerari clerum, deterius prae gentibus quaesierunt libertatem ecclesiae et, quantum ad eos pertinet, abstulisse noscuntur. It is noticeable that Henry the Fifth is referred to as primus; and so he is always designated in the commentary on Jeremiah; as Henry the Sixth is there called secundus.

[4] In Jeremiah, p. 330.

[5] In Jerem. p. 310.

[6] Non tantum sua Romanus praeses exiget quasi temporalia (it should doubtless read: temporalia quasi sua), sed etiam spiritualia, quae non sua. L. c. p. 310.

[7] Ubi pro terrenis ambitionibus sibi prohibitis temporalem gladium exemit, et filios suos eventibus dubiis, velut oves occisionis exponit, non revolvens animo quod scriptura praeloquitur, p. 7.

[8] In Jerem. p. 370

" which leads it to place more confidence in men than in God; and hence it happens, by a just judgment, that destruction comes from the very quarter whence it looked for help. Surely, when we turn our eye to the root of this evil, it must be plain to us that the church, founded upon the lowly Christ, ought to keep far from pride; and she has reason to fear, that if she strives after earthly riches, these will finally be driven away like chaff before the wind. The church ought, in these times, when she is oppressed by those of her own household, to place her confidence, not in worldly goods, but in the power of God. If believing princes have offered some gifts to the poor Christ, still, the spiritual order, waxen fat with abundance, must not give themselves up to pride; but rather distribute their superfluous wealth to the poor, and not to the giants, who have helped to build the tower of Babel (the high prelates, by whom the secularization of the church is promoted). Gold was brought to Christ, that he might have the means of fleeing to Egypt; myrrh was offered him, as if in allusion to his death; incense, that he might praise God, not that he might rise up against Herod, or fall as a burden upon Pharaoh; not that he might give himself up to sensual delights, or reward benefits received with ingratitude. The vicegerents of Christ, in these latter times, care nothing for the incense; they seek only the gold; in order that, with great Babylon, they may mingle the golden goblets, and pollute their followers with their own uncleanliness." " Because the cardinals, priests, and different orders of the clergy, who at present are very seldom followers of the lowly Christ, use the goods of the churches in the service of their lusts; therefore the princes of the world, who behold the disgrace of the sanctuary, stretch out their hands to the property of the church, believing that by so doing they render a service to the Most High."[1] " The church," says he,[2] " can and could retire into solitude, lead a spiritual life, abide in communion with Christ, her bridegroom; and through her love to him she would become mistress of the world, and perhaps no longer be subject to pay quitrent. But, alas! in loving the friendship of secular princes, and grasping without shame after earthly incomes, she is humiliated, in the same proportion as she lowered herself down to such familiarity and concupiscence." As Joachim believed the popes were paving the way for the overthrow of their own power, by seeking to hold it up with worldly props, instead of confiding solely on the power of God, so he looked upon it as one evidence of the weakness they had brought upon themselves, that they must in the twelfth century so often seek a refuge in France. He warns them " to see to it, lest that French power might prove to them a broken reed."

Joachim was full of zeal for the essential matter of an inward, living Christianity; and hence he decried that confidence in externals, which tended to render men secure in their sins, and to draw them away from true penitence. " Many of the laity," says he,[3] " expect to be saved by the offerings of the priests and the prayers of the regular

[1] In Esaiam, p. 28. [2] In Jerem. p. 56. [3] L. c. p. 104.

clergy, even while they give themselves up to sin. But in vain look they to such gods for help. Their incense is an abomination to God."[1] "That which is represented outwardly in the sacraments," says he, "can be of no saving benefit whatever to a man if in his daily actions he does not strive to live conformably to what is thus outwardly represented. "For why wast thou baptized unto Christ, if thou wilt not be pure? Why art thou buried in baptism, if thou wilt continue to live in sin? Why dost thou partake of the body of Christ, that was offered for thee, if thou are not willing to die for Christ, if it be necessary?[2] The sacraments, then, do nothing for those that abuse them; they benefit those only who so live as the sacraments signify."[3] Against sanctimonious monks he says:[4] "They pass current for living men with those who are carnal and carnally minded, those who look merely on the outside, the visible appearance, and cannot see the idols within. Thus, they allow themselves to be deceived, praise and extol these miserable creatures, in whom there is nothing to praise, and hope for the forgiveness of their sins through the merits of those whose souls at the end of the present life sink to perdition." Concerning fleshly representations of the divine Being, he says: "A God like this is not the God of believers, but of unbelievers, an idolatrous image of the human mind and not God."[5] The jealousies subsisting between the different ranks in the church, and the different orders of monks, seemed to him most directly at variance with that pattern of the apostolic church which was constantly present to his mind. "In those times," says he, "there were manifold forms of life corresponding to different gradations of the development of the Christian life; but all were united together in the organism of the body of Christ, as harmonizing parts of one whole."[6]

Joachim agreed with Hildegard in announcing a terrible judgment that was coming upon the corrupted church, from which, however, she was to emerge purified and refined. It was also a characteristic point in the prophetical picture which floated before his imagination, that the secular power was to combine with the heretical sects in combating the church. As in Italy and Sicily, the name "Patarenes,"[7] was a popular and current name applied to sects, so the

[1] Notandum est, quod laici quidam putant se sanari victimis sacerdotum et orationibus regularium, cum ipsi mala committant. Sed frustra tales dii eos adjuvant, nam incensum abominatio est mihi, holocaustomata nihilominus reproba esse demonstrant.

[2] In Apocalyps. p. 91.

[3] Licet haec omnia in sacramento fidelibus data sint, non potest tamen tenere illa, nisi id explere studeat moribus, quod sacramenti similitudo docet esse tenendum. Non igitur sacramenta conferunt aliquid abutentibus eis, sed his, qui ita vivunt, quomodo sacramenta significant.

[4] L. c. p. 78.

[5] Deus, qui talis ist, non est Deus fidelium, sed infidelium, idolum animarum et non Deus. P. 101, in the Tractatus de concordia veteris et novi testamenti.

[6] Quam vero longe sit omnis moderna religio a forma ecclesiae primitivae, eo ipso intelligi potest, quod illa apostolos et evangelistas, doctores et virgines, et zelantes vitam continentem et conjugatos veluti unus cortex mali Punici divisis tamen cellulis mansionum conjugebat in unum et conjunctis membrorum speciebus efficiebat ex omnibus unum corpus. Nunc autem alibi corpus et membra, singula pro seipsis, non pro aliis sunt sollicita. L. c. p. 71.

[7] See above, p. 99, and the passages there cited.

Patarenes, according to him, were to be the instrument for the execution of the divine judgment, — forerunners of the antichrist, from whom the latter himself was to proceed; — a king, and probably, in conjunction with him, a false pope also. A pope, springing up from among the Patarenes, and armed with a seeming power of working miracles, would league himself with the antichrist of the secular power in the attack on the church, and stir up the latter against the faithful, as Simon Magus is said to have incited Nero to the persecution of the Christians.[1] He was inclined to represent the antichrist as an incarnation of Satan, through whom the great enemy of all good would seek to accomplish against the church what he had hitherto attempted in vain. All the previous machinations of Satan against the church were but a preparation for this final attack, in which all preceding wickedness was to be concentrated; in which Satan, foreseeing the last judgment near at hand, would expend his rage in a last desperate effort.[2]

The house of Hohenstaufen hold a prominent place in his description of the judgment that was to come upon the secularized church. In the details, we meet with a great deal which is vague and self-contradictory; moreover, it admits of a question whether his predictions at this point may not have been interpolated, so as to agree with the issue of events.[3] When, in the year 1197,[4] at the particular invitation of the emperor Henry the Sixth, he wrote his commentary on the prophet Jeremiah, he expresses himself in one place[5] as uncertain whether or not another emperor would yet intervene between him and his heirs.[6] Such an intervening emperor did in fact come in, after the death of Henry, in the same year. He foretold, though without intimating that the event was so near at hand, that Frederic the Second would remain under the tutelage of his mother Constantia, and that — if the Roman see did not care to preserve for him the empire which another[7] would make himself master of — he would stand forth as ruler and pour out upon the church a mortal poison.[8]

[1] In Jerem. p. 123. The secta falsorum christianorum et haereticorum, quorum caput erit antichristus, et forsitan pseudopapa erit adjutus et fultus antichristo reipublicae; and p. 143, we find, as the seventh and last persecutor of the church, the antichristus, rex Patarenorum.

[2] Et sciendum, quod in primis temporibus proeliatus est diabolus in membris suis, in extremis vero temporibus proeliabitur in illo, qui erit caput et primus omnium reproborum, in quo et habitabit specialius ac si in vase proprio per seipsum, ut malum, quod princeps daemonum nequivit explere, ipse quasi magnus et potens expleat in furore fortitudinis suae. In the concordia 130, 2.

[3] In the commentary on Isaiah, p. 4, is cited a vaticinium Silvestri de Frederico Secundo, et ejus posteris: Erit in insidiis sponsae agni, quam praesules dilaniant et absorbent.

[4] Commentar. in Jerem. p. 331.

[5] L. c. p. 86. He says to him: Et jugum patris tui vix pontifices potuerunt portare et minimus digitus tuus lumbis est grossior patris tui.

[6] Utrum inter Henricum hunc et haeredem alius surgat, illi videbunt, qui superer-unt. L. c. p. 86.

[7] Otho the Fourth.

[8] L. c. p. 299. Sub nomine viduae tangit consortem tuam Constantiam, cujus pupillus filius erit. Puto quoque, si Romana sedes post te de manu calumniatoris posita accessoris regnum liberare neglexerit, versa vice pupillus mutatus in regulum super eam mortalia venena diffundet. He says that, under him, the fastigium imperiale would decline, protendetur vita ejus, quasi vita regis in 60 annis. He announces, in the year 1197, the persecution proceeding from the Hohenstaufen house against the

Sometimes the year 1200, sometimes 1260, is mentioned as one which would constitute an epoch in history.

Joachim, as we have said, was an opponent of the prevailing dialectic tendency in theology. Hence the latter days of the church, when it should have come forth glorified out of the refining process, appeared to him as a time of all-satisfying contemplation, taking the place of that learning which dwells on the letter and finite conceptions of the understanding, when the inspiration of love, that meditation on divine things which can solve all problems, would follow an imperfect, fragmentary, conceptual knowledge. Connected with this is a division of the different periods of revelation and of history, which from this time onward recurs repeatedly under various phases, — a division conformable to the doctrine of the trinity. Although, by virtue of their essential unity, all the three persons ever work together, and somewhat belonging properly to each person is to be found in every period, yet, at the same time, in relation to the distinction of persons, the predominant activity of some one amongst the three is to be distinguished according to the measure of three principal periods. The times of the Old Testament belong especially to God the Father; in it, God revealed himself as the Almighty, by signs and wonders; next, followed the times of the New Testament, in which God, as the Word, revealed himself in his wisdom, where the striving after a comprehensible knowledge of mysteries predominates; the last times belong to the Holy Spirit, when the fire of love in contemplation will predominate.[1] As the letter of the Old Testament answers to God the Father, the letter of the New Testament more especially to the Son, so the spiritual understanding, which proceeds from both, answers to the Holy Spirit.[2] As all things were created by the Father through the Son; so in the Holy Spirit, as love, all were to find their completion.[3] To the working of the Father, — power, fear, faith, more especially correspond; to the working of the Son, — humility, truth, and wisdom; to the working of the Holy Spirit, — love, joy, and freedom.[4] In connection with this must be considered the way in which he contemplates the three apostles — Peter, Paul, and John — as representatives of the three periods in the process of the development of the church. John represents the contemplative bent, and as he labored where Peter and Paul

Romish church, in 64 annos deteriores prioribus. L. c. p. 331.

[1] The words in John 5: 17, according to the Vulgate: "Pater meus usque modo operatur, et ego operor," he explains as follows: "Till now the Father has worked; from henceforth I work." When accused of Tritheism on this account, he retaliated by accusing his opponents of Sabellianism: Non attendentes, quod sicut vere in personis proprietas est et in essentia unitas, ita quaedam sint, quae propter proprietatem personarum proprie adscribantur patri, quaedam, quae proprie adscribantur filio, quaedam, quae proprie spiritui sancto, et quae propter unitatem essentiae ipsamet communiter referantur ad omnes. Introduct. in Apocalyps. p. 13.

[2] Ut litera testamenti prioris proprietate quadam similitudinis videtur pertinere ad patrem, litera testamenti novi pertinere ad filium, ita spiritalis intelligentia, quae procedit ex utraque, ad spiritum sanctum. L. c. p. 5.

[3] Quoniam sicut a patre omnia sunt et per filium omnia, ita et in spiritu sancto, qui est caritas Dei, consummanda sunt universa. In Apocalyps. p. 84.

[4] Nonnulla specialius attribuuntur patri, sicuti potentia, timor et fides, nonnulla filio, ut humilitas, veritas et sapientia, nonnulla spiritui sancto, ut caritas, gaudium et libertas. L. c. p. 48.

had already laid the foundation, and survived the other apostles, so the Johannean contemplative period would be the last times of the church, corresponding to the age of the Holy Spirit. As the Father revealed himself in the Old Testament, and the Son, after the completion of the Old, introduced the New; so this relation corresponds to that of Paul to Peter; since Paul did not labor on the foundation which Peter had laid, but opened for himself an independent field of action; and as then the completion was given to the whole by John, so in the last Johannean period, that which the Son began will be carried to its completion by the Holy Spirit.[1] Then will the promise of the Lord be fulfilled; that he had yet many things to say which his disciples could not then bear; that this Spirit should guide into all truth. In the words spoken by Christ to John (John 21 : 23), "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" he finds an intimation of the fact that the Johannean period would be the last.[2] He says of John, "What he himself had drunk out of the heart of Christ, that he has given the chosen to drink; the living water, which he had drunk from the fountain of life; for the living water is the Holy Scriptures, in their spiritual sense, which was not written with ink, pen, and paper, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the book of man's heart."[3] John is the representative of the contemplative, as Peter, of the practical tendency; the latter prefigures the clerical, the former the monastic, order. When Peter (John 21 : 21) supposes that John also was to be a martyr, by this is signified the jealousy of the practical class towards the contemplative: they reproach the latter with leading so easy and quiet a life, and taking no share in their toils: they do not consider that it costs quite as much self-denial to human nature, patiently to wait the revelation of God, and to give one's self up entirely to the contemplation of divine things, as to pursue bodily labor; to sit in one spot, as to be driven about in a multiplicity of employments. As after the martyrdom of Peter, John alone remained, so when the order of the clergy shall have perished in martyrdom, following Christ, in the last conflict with antichrist, the order of the contemplative, genuine monks shall alone remain, and the entire succession of St. Peter pass over into that.[4] The order of genuine contemplatives and spiritales, prefigured by Jesus himself, might perhaps — he supposes, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse — be already existing in the germ; but as yet it could not be observed, *because the beginnings of a new creation are ever wont to be obscure*

[1] Et illud diligenter observa, quod quando inter Petrum et Joannem interponitur Paulus, tunc Petrus designat personam patris, Paulus filii, Joannes spiritus sancti, et quia Paulus non superaedificavit a principio in his, quae Petrus fundavit, fundavit autem ipse per se (et superaedificavit Joannes), unigenitum Dei patris in hoc ipso designat, qui consummato veteri testamento, quod specialius pertinebat ad patrem, inchoavit testamentum novum, quod specialius pertinet ad seipsum, superveniet autem spiritus sanctus, consummaturus, quae inchoata sunt et fundata a filio.

[2] Significat electos tertii status. In Apocalyps. p. 84.

[3] In Apocalyps. p. 3.

[4] Relinquatur pars illa electorum, quae designata est in Joanne, ad quam oportet transire totam Petri successionem, deficiente parte illa laboriosa, quae designata est in Petro, data ubique tranquillitate amatoribus Christi. In tempore nempe illo erit Dominus unus et nomen ejus unum. L. c. p. 77.

and contemptible.[1] The abbot Joachim was filled with that same idea, — an idea called forth by the antagonism to the secularization of the church, — which had seized many serious minds of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and which gave birth to the first societies of the Waldenses as well as of the Franciscans. Accordingly, he must be a prophet for all appearances of a kindred character.

Each of the three great apostles had his peculiar gift of grace, conformable to the peculiar position which he took in the process of the development of the church. And, as this process was thereby prefigured, so each period in the history of the church has its peculiar gift of grace, belonging to this peculiar position. We should not expect to find everything, therefore, in every age. Peter represents the power of faith which works miracles; Paul, knowledge; and John, contemplation.[2]

In these last times was to be concentrated every divine element from the earlier periods. The planting and sowing of many years would be collected together at one point, — a period, though short in compass, yet greatest in intrinsic importance in reference to the fulness of grace there accumulated.[3] In the first period, the fathers laid themselves out in announcing God's great work of the creation; in the second, it was the effort of the Son to lay the foundation of hidden wisdom. When man, by means of the two Testaments, had now come to know how God had finished all things in wisdom, what still remains (for the third age) except to praise God, whose works are so great. The Father comes, as it were, when from the *things that are made* we come to the knowledge of the *Maker*, when in the contemplation of his almighty power we are filled with reverence; the Son comes to us, when we explore into the depths of doctrine in the discourses of him who is the Father's wisdom. The Holy Ghost comes and reposes in our hearts, when we taste the sweetness of his love, so that we break forth into songs of praise to God rather than keep silence.[4] Then will ensue the time of an Easter jubilee, in which all mysteries will be laid open, the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord, and it will be scarcely possible any longer to find a man, who will dare deny that Christ is the Son of God.[5] The Spirit will stand forth free from the veil of the letter. It is the gospel of the

[1] Qui videlicet ordo prae multis aliis, qui praecesserunt eum, amabilis et praeclarus infra limitem quidem secundi status initiandus est, si tamen usque adhuc non est in aliquibus initiandus, quod tamen mihi adhuc non constat, *quia initia semper obscura et contemptibilia sunt.* In Apocalyps. p. 83, c. 2.

[2] Etsi Petro, apostolorum primo, data est praerogativa fidei ad facienda signa in typo eorum, qui dati sunt in fundamentis ecclesiae, non ideo tamen parvi pendenda est clavis scientiae, quae data est Paulo, apostolorum novissimo, haud dubium quin in typo eorum, qui dandi erant in fine ad superaedificandam ecclesiam. Novit nempe ille, qui pro temporum varietate dona distribuenda partitur, quid illis atque illis expediat, ita ut pro tempore existimandum sit, quid cui praeferatur, et illud pro tempore magis eorum quod utile et non quod sublimius judicandum. L. c. p. 88.

[3] Etsi spatium illius temporis breve erit, gratiarum tamen copiosius caeteris, ut multorum annorum segetes congregentur in uno. In Apocalyps. p. 84.

[4] Spiritus sanctus ad corda nostra venire et requiescere dicitur, cum dulcedo amoris ejus quam suavis sit degustamus, ita ut psallere magis libeat, quam a Dei laude tacere. L. c. p. 85.

[5] L. c. p. 9.

Spirit, the everlasting gospel; for the gospel of the letter is but temporary.[1]

It was this doctrine of the abbot Joachim which was afterwards apprehended and applied in so many different ways; which in fact, at a later period, came to be so interpreted, by a one-sided rationalistico-pantheistic party, as to make Christianity itself, which was considered but a transient form of religious development, cease, and give place to a higher position, a purely inward religion of the Spirit, consisting of some intuition of God that no longer needed an intermediate organ. Joachim was very far from holding Christianity in itself to be a transient form of the manifestation of religion. The knowledge, transcending all doubt, of Jesus as the Son of God, he considered indeed, as we have seen, as something distinguishing those last times of the Holy Spirit; he taught expressly[2] that two Testaments only were to be received; for the last revelation of the Holy Spirit was in fact to serve no other purpose than to make men conscious of the hidden spiritual meaning of both Testaments, and to let the spirit unfold itself out of the covering of the letter. Yet at the same time we must admit that the ideal, pantheistic interpretation above mentioned, found a point to fix upon in several of Joachim's expressions; for instance, when he described the humility of self-debasement in the form of a servant as the peculiarity of the Son, the abiding in his spiritual exaltation, the purely spiritual revelation, as the peculiarity of the Holy Spirit, and hence assigned the advanced position of perfect freedom to the agency of the Holy Spirit;[3] when he represented that position as a subordinate one, to which the divine must be brought nigh, by the revelation of God to sense in the incarnation of the Son, and by the instrumentalities corresponding thereto; and, on the other hand, that of the *spiritales*, who needed no such sensible medium, as the highest. "Say not, I have no teacher to explain to me in detail what I read. Where the Spirit is the teacher, a little spark increases to an immeasurable flame, and because the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us, and he who by reason of the simplicity of his essence was invisible, dignified man's nature by appearing visibly in it, so he would be preached by visible men under the veil of the Word, that they who were unable by contemplation to penetrate into the mysteries of the divine essence, might through visible emblems soar upward to the exalted. But with spiritual men it is not so: but the purer their hearts are, the more do they by God's invisible operations, which are nearer to them, stretch the vision of their spiritual eyes to the Creator

[1] Evangelium aeternum, quod est in spiritu, quoniam utique evangelium, quod est in litera, temporale est, non aeternum. In Apocalyps. p. 95.

[2] Haec est causa, pro qua non tria testamenta, sed duo esse scribuntur, quorum concordia manet integra. L. c. p. 13.

[3] His words: Et quia aquae natura gravis est et humilia petit, ignis pro levitate sua ad superiora recurrit, quid est, quod frequentius filius assimilatur aquae, spiritus vero sanctus crebrius igni, nisi quia, quod non fecit spiritus sanctus, filius semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, spiritus autem sanctus, de quo dicitur: ubi spiritus, ibi libertas, nequaquam eo modo, quo filius humiliatus est, sed in majestate gloriae suae, non assumta carne permansit. In Apocalyps. p. 55.

of all."[1] But such language merely expresses, though in an original and forcible manner, the chosen position of mysticism which gives special prominence to the work of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts; and such passages can by no means furnish any foundation for the charge, that he would speak disparagingly of historical Christianity. Yet we must allow, that at the bottom of the whole mode of intuition set forth in his works, lies the thought, that the entire revelation of the Old and New Testaments contains, indeed, immutable truth, and that Christianity is in itself a complete and immutable thing; but yet, at the same time, this does not hold good of the different forms of its manifestation. The overthrow of the particular ecclesiastical form then existing, and a new, more complete development of Christianity in the consciousness of mankind, in which the inner revelation of the Holy Spirit will take the place of outward authority, is predicted by him. This is in fact already implied in what he says, in his own way, concerning the transition of the Petrine position into that of John, the dissolution of the clerical governance of the church and its rehabilitation in the community of the contemplative life. Doubtless he supposes, as the peculiarity of those last times, a direct and unmediated reference of the religious consciousness of all men, to God manifested in Christ, so that there would be no more need of an order of teachers.[2] Then the prophecy of Jeremiah, that God himself would be the teacher of men, and would write his law in the hearts of all, would meet with its fulfilment; but as all earthly greatness must come to shame, when the sublimity of things heavenly revealed itself, so it was only by humbling himself that man could become capable of beholding such divine glory.[3]

Especially deserving of notice are the following words in the book written by abbot Joachim, on "The Harmony between the Old and New Testaments," (Concordiae Veteris ac Novi Testamenti;) in which, speaking of the relation of changeable forms to the unchangeable essence in the revelation of divine things, he thus expresses himself.[4] "The Holy Spirit is the fire which consumes all this. Why? Because there is nothing durable on earth; for so long as we see through a glass darkly, it is necessary for us to cling to those symbols, and so long are we unable to come to the knowledge of that truth which is

Qui erat invisibilis pro suae simplicitate naturae, per humanae assumtionem substantiae visibilis fieri dignatus est, voluit per visibiles homines vocis mysteria personari, ut hi qui arcana divinitatis penetrare contemplando non poterant, visibilibus ad sublimia raperentur exemplis. Non sic autem spiritales, non sic, sed quo illorum corda mundiora sunt, eo per invisibilia Dei opera, quae sibi viciniora sunt, in ipsum, qui creator est omnium, spiritalium oculorum aciem intellectualiter figunt. In Apocalyps. p. 49.

[2] Quasi per alios pascuntur oves, cum ad docendas subditorum ecclesias pastores in populis eligi ntur, cum autem veritatem evangelicam clarificat per spiritum suum ad complendam prophetiam Jerem 31: 33, 34; quasi jam non per alios Dominus, sed ipse per semetipsum requiret oves suas, sicut visitat pastor gregem suum in die, quando fuerit in medio ovium suarum dissipatarum.

[3] Et quia mirabilis est Deus in sanctis suis et longe mirabilior in majestate sua, necesse est, ut semetipsum dejiciat, qui videre tantam gloriam existimatur dignus, quia nimirum terrena altitudo confunditur, cum celsitudo coelestium aperitur. In Apocalyps. p. 45.

[4] L. c. p. 103.

represented in symbols. But when the Spirit of truth shall come and teach us all truth, what further need shall we then have of symbols?[1] For as with the communion of the body of Christ the partaking of the paschal lamb was done away, so when the Holy Ghost shall reveal himself in his glory, the observation of symbols will cease; men will no longer follow figures but the truth, — which is the simplest, and which is symbolized by fire, — as the Lord says, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. Dust and water, such is the historical letter of the two Testaments, — which letter was given by the Holy Spirit for the purpose of pointing thereby to something else, rather than for the sake of the literal historical sense itself; that is, that thereby the spiritual understanding, which is the divine fire, by virtue of which the spiritual man judges all men and is judged by none, might be presented to us; for neither the partaking of bread and meat, nor the drinking of wine and water, nor the anointing with oil, is anything eternal, but that is eternal which is signified by these acts. If, then, the things themselves and their use are perishable, but that which is represented by them, the thing which endures forevermore; then, with good right, is the former consumed by the fire, while the fire itself lives alone, without depending on anything sensible, in the hearts of the faithful, and abides forever. And, although there are many visible things, which will eternally remain, as they are revealed to us in the letter of the two Testaments, yet they will not remain forever in the same form, but rather in the form appointed for the future. For amongst the rest, that which according to the Catholic faith shall remain forever, the body of Christ, — which shall ever remain as it is taken up into unity with his person, — is to us especially an object of veneration. And yet our Lord himself declared the spirit maketh alive, the flesh profiteth nothing. Hence the apostle Paul also says, The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive. But if, in reference to the body of Christ himself, the letter is consumed by the spirit, how much more will this be the case with other things. Far be it from us, then, to say that the things themselves will be consumed as to their whole essence; but we say that they themselves, that is, their symbols, must pass over to represent something spiritual, in order that we may elevate ourselves, through the scripture of visible things, as through a glass, to the intuition of invisible things."

History of Monasticism.

The reaction of this prophetic spirit against the secularization of the church proceeded from monasticism, as did many an appearance of the same kind down to the time of Luther; nor was this an accidental thing, but connected with the essential character of monasticism itself; for we may regard it generally as a reaction, though one-sided.

[1] Quid nobis ulterius de figuris?

of the Christian spirit, against the secularization of the church and of the Christian life. It is true, monasticism was itself seized, and borne along, by the current of secularization; but even then, it ever gave birth to new reactions of reform against the encroaching tide of corruption. This form of the manifestation of Christian life and of Christian society belongs among the most significant and the most influential facts of these periods, in which the very good and the very bad are found so often meeting together.

Monasticism stood forth against the wild life of the knights, and the corruption of a degenerate clergy; and many were impelled to fly for refuge from the latter to the former. The Hildebrandian epoch of reform, near the close of the eleventh century, was accompanied with the outpouring of a spirit of compunction and repentance on the Western nations. It was the same spirit, which in different directions, promoted the crusades, monasticism, and the spread of sects that contended against the hierarchy. By the political storms which broke up the interior organization of the nations, by the ruinous contests of this age between church and state, many were impelled to seek in the monasteries a quiet retreat for the cultivation of the Christian life. Thus it happened in Germany, amidst the ferocious contests between the party of Henry the Fourth and that of Gregory the Seventh. An extraordinary multitude of men, of the first rank, retired from the world; and the three monasteries, in which the greater number congregated, St. Blasen in the Black Forest, Hirsau, and the convent of St. Salvator in Schaffhausen, had not room enough to contain them all, so that it was necessary to make great additions to the old structures. Men of the first rank were here to be seen among the monks, selecting from preference and engaging with delight in the most menial employments, and serving as cooks, bakers, or shepherds.[1] The impulse to community,— the characteristic of energetic, creative times, belongs among the peculiar features of this time, and such communities easily formed themselves around any man that showed an enthusiasm for religion, that spoke and acted in the power of faith, and in love; and then took the form of monasticism.

But the causes differed widely in their nature, which led men to choose this mode of life; and for this very reason the directions of life in monasticism would also be different. Oftentimes the deep piety of mothers, patterns of Christian virtue in the family circle, stood out in striking contrast with the mere worldly pursuits of their husbands in the knightly order, or in the life at court. When such mothers looked forward to the birth of their first child, or when they had much to suffer and great peril was before them, they would vow before the altar, to devote the child, in case it should be a male, wholly to the service of God; that is, to destine him for the spiritual or the monas-

[1] Berthold. Constant. Chronicon, at the year 1083, in Monumenta res Alemannorum illustrantia, t. ii, p. 120. Quanto nobiliores erant in saeculo, tanto se contemtibilioribus officiis occupari desiderant, ut qui quondam erant comites vel marchiones in saeculo nunc in coquina vel pistrino fratribus servire vel porcos eorum in campis pascere pro summis deliciis computent.

tic order,— as we see in the examples of the mother of the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, near the beginning of the twelfth century,[1] and of the mother of the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux. The boys were trained up under the influence of these sincerely pious mothers, in the society of devout clergymen and monks; the love for a life consecrate to God was instilled into their youthful minds; and although they might afterwards, in the age of youth, be drawn aside by a different sort of society, by the wild spirit of the times, or by the prevailing enthusiasm for the new paths struck out in science,—from the inclination excited in them in the years of childhood,— still, the deep impression would subsequently be revived again with new force, and so, under peculiar circumstances, recalling the feelings and purposes of former days, the resolution of devoting themselves wholly to monasticism would ripen to maturity in them. Thus were formed the great men of the monastic life. But it so happened too, that children, — either on occasions like those just mentioned, or else to lighten the expense of a numerous family, were delivered over to convents as *oblati;* and by such persons, who had not chosen this mode of life of their own impulse, or from their own disgust with a world lying in wickedness, it was followed, only because it favored idleness and easy living. The abbot Guibert complains that, towards the close of the eleventh century, worldly living had, through the multitude of such *oblati*, got the upperhand in the monasteries, whose possessions were wastefully squandered by these monks.[2] When persons who had lived from their childhood in absolute dependence and complete retirement from the world, were sent away by their abbots on foreign business, they were the more inclined to abuse a liberty which they now enjoyed for the first time.[3] It was a matter of general remark, that young men who turned monks out of penitence for their sins, became afterwards the most distinguished for zeal in their profession; while others, who had not been impelled to the choice of this life by any such powerful inward impulse, and any such deep-felt need, either failed altogether of possessing the right zeal, or else lost what they once had.[4] Men of the first rank, struck by the force of momentary impressions, or by sudden reverses of fortune reminded of the uncertain nature of earthly goods, the nearness of death, the vanity of all

[1] See his Life, c. iii. When death threatened her and her child, initur ex necessitate consilium et ad dominicae matris altare concurritur, et ad eam, quae sola sive etiam virgo semper futura pepererat, hujusmodi vota promuntur, ac oblationis vice arae imponitur, quod videlicet si partus ille cecisset in masculum, Deo et sibi obsecuturus clericatui traderetur.

[2] Nostris monasteria vetustissima numero extenuata temporibus, rerum antiquitus datarum exuberante copia, parvis erant contenta conventibus, in quibus perpauci reperiri poterant, qui peccati fastidio saeculum respuissent, sed ab illis potissimum detinebantur ecclesiae, qui in eisdem parentum devotione contraditi, ab incunte nutriebantur aetate. Qui quantum minorem super suis, quae nulla sibi videbantur egisse, malis metum habebant, tanto intra coenobiorum septa remissiore studio victitabant. See his Life, c. viii.

[3] Qui administrationes ac officia forastica cum pro abbatum aut necessitate aut libitu sortirentur, utpote voluntatis propriae avidi exterioresque licentias minus experti, ecclesiasticas occasione facili dilapidare pecunias.

[4] The words of Caesarius of Heisterbach, Distinct. i, c. iv: Rarum esse, quod pueri vel juvenes ad ordinem venientes, quorum conscientias pondus peccati non gravat, ferventes sint, vel in ordine tepide et minus bene vivunt vel ab ordine prorsus recedunt.

worldly glory, retired to solitude as anchorets, or entered a monastery; and a single example of this sort would be followed by multitudes. This effect was produced by the example of a certain count Ebrard (Everard) of Breteul, in Picardy, near the end of the eleventh century. He was a young man of noble parentage, and possessed of an ample fortune, who, struck with a sense of the emptiness of all his pleasures, and seized with the craving after some higher good, forsook all, and joined himself with a number of others, who travelled about as itinerant charcoal-burners, thus earning their daily bread. "In this poverty," says the writer of the narrative, "he believed that he first found the true riches." Somewhat later, he retired, with his companions, to a convent, having become sensible of the dangers which beset the Christian life, in the anchorite condition;[1] one of his contemporaries, Simon, also descended from a very rich and powerful family, was so struck at beholding his father's corpse, — a man who but just before held a high place in the world, — as to conceive a disgust of all earthly glory. He at once left his family, and became a monk in some foreign country. When he returned afterwards to his native district, his appearance and words made so strong an impression on men and women, that numbers followed his example. The Cistercian monk, Caesarius of Heisterbach, in the first half of the thirteenth century, sets forth, in a way that deserves to be noticed, the different causes which led people to embrace the monastic life. What he felt constrained, in the case of some, to attribute to an awakening by divine grace, he found reason, in the case of others, to ascribe to the instigation of an evil spirit; while in still others, he traced it to fickleness of temper; as, for example, in the case of those who, following the impulse of a momentary and transient interest, mistook their own nature, and neglected to consider whether it was the fear of hell or the longing after a heavenly home that operated upon their feelings. Countless numbers were driven to this step by circumstances of distress; sickness, poverty, imprisonment, shame, remorse following the commission of crime, and the present fear of death.[2] When attacked by fatal diseases, many put themselves under a vow that, in case they recovered, they would become monks; or they enshrouded themselves at once in monkish robes, persuaded that by so doing they would be more likely to obtain salvation. And such persons, if they recovered, actually became monks.[3] Those who had been driven to this step by the fear of death, did not always, however, remain true to a purpose thus conceived; and there were complaints,

[1] How the monastic life was introduced by him from France, and brought into a flourishing state in these districts, is related by the abbot Guibert, Vita, c. ix: Cum ad eos (the monks) pretii vix ullus accederet, ad excitandas plurimorum mentes emersit.

[2] Distinct. i. c. v. Caesarius of Heisterbach cites individual examples to show how a canonicus became a monk, because he had played away his clothes, i, 9, c. xii. A young man belonging to a wealthy family thought of turning monk, without the knowledge of his parents, because he had gambled away a large sum of money; but he gave up the notion when a friend came forward and paid up his debts, c. xxviii.

[3] L. c. c. xxv.

that in changing their garb they had not altered their manners.[1] It happened not unfrequently that criminals, on whom sentence of death had been passed, were, through the influence of venerated abbots who condescended to intercede for them, first pardoned, and then committed to the care of their deliverers, with a view to try what could be done for them under the discipline of the monastery; and as in these times, many were hurried into crimes by the impulses of a sensuous and passionate nature, which had never felt the wholesome restraints of education and religious instruction, it was possible that such, by judicious teaching, by the force of religious impressions, and the severe discipline to which they were subjected in a cloister, under the direction of some wise abbot, might be really reformed,—as examples, in fact, show that they sometimes were.[2] When Bernard of Clairvaux was once going to pay a visit to his friend, the pious count Theobald of Champagne, he was met by a crowd of men conducting to the place of execution a robber who, after committing many crimes, had been condemned to the gallows. He begged it as a favor of the count that the criminal might be given up to him. He took the man along with him to Clairvaux, and there succeeded in transforming him into a pious man. This reformed criminal died in peace, after having spent thirty years in the cloister as a monk.[3] Thus the monasteries proved in some instances to be houses of correction for abandoned criminals; and the spirit of Christian charity, which proceeded from pious monks, first strove to abolish the punishment of death. Another monk, Bernard, founder of the congregation of the monks of Tiron, in the diocese of Chartres, A. D. 1113, had settled himself down near the close of the eleventh century as a hermit, on the island of Causeum (Chaussey), between the island of Jersey and St. Malo. It so happened while he was there, that pirates landed on the beach with a merchant-vessel which they had captured. Bernard labored earnestly, but in vain, for the conversion of these barbarians; in vain did he strive to move their pity for the crew, whom they had taken and bound in chains; but when they left the shore, he still did not cease praying both for pirates and prisoners. Soon after, there came up a great storm; the pirates saw nothing before them but shipwreck and death. Struck with alarm and remorse of conscience, they set free the captives, mutually confessed to each other their sins; and vowed, if they should be saved, to amend their lives, and go on pilgrimages to various shrines. But one of them, on whose heart the words of Bernard had made an indelible impression, reminded the others of this holy man: "They should only vow," said he to them, "that if the Lord would conduct them to the good hermit, they would implicitly

[1] Orderic. Vital. hist. l. iii, f. 468, says of a priest, who had led a trifling life, and in sickness had put on the monkish garb, but afterwards relapsed into his former vicious habits: Habitum, non mores mutavit.

[2] An example of this sort is stated by Caesarius, c. xxxi, of a predatory knight, who, after having been condemned to death, and reprieved at the request of the abbot Daniel of Schönau, was permitted to enter the Cistercian order to do penance for his sins; and he adds: Frequenter huic similia audivi, scilicet ut homines flagitiosi pro suis criminibus variis suppliciis deputati, beneficio ordinis sint liberati.

[3] Vitae l. vii, c. xv, ed. Mabillon, t. ii, f. 1204.

follow his directions, and by his mediation they might be saved from death." All united in taking the vow. Four of the ships were foundered; the fifth got safely to the island. The pirates, awakened to repentance, fell down before monk Bernard, and besought him to listen to the confession of their sins, and to impose on them such penance as he thought fit. Some he bade perform their vow of a pilgrimage; others continued to remain under his spiritual direction on the island.[1]

In the beginning of the twelfth century, when the enthusiasm for the new dialectic inquiries in France had seized hold on numbers,— and among the rest, on such as merely followed the current without any call or talent for such studies; many of these soon became disgusted with the idle pursuit, and by this very disgust were led to take a serious spiritual direction in monasticism.[2] How monasticism was regarded, in its relation to the worldly life, we find expressed in the following remarks of Anselm of Canterbury, where he is exhorting one of his friends to become a monk:[3] "Whatever glory of this world it may be which thou wouldst aspire after, yet remember its end, and the fruit, at the end; and then consider, on the other hand, what the expectations of those are, who despise all the glory of this world. Dost thou say, it is not monks only who are saved? I admit it. But who attains to salvation in the most certain, who in the most noble, way; the man who seeks to love God alone, or he who seeks to unite the love of God with the love of the world? But perhaps it will be said, even in monasticism there is danger! O, why does not he who says this, consider what he says? Is it rational, when danger is on every side, to choose to remain where it is greatest? And if he who seeks to love God alone perseveres to the end, his salvation is secure. But if he who is determined to love the world, does not alter his plan of living before the end, there remains for him either no salvation at all, or else a doubtful or a less one." Yet here, it is all along presupposed that an objective contrariety exists between the inclination to the world and the inclination to God; and not that all activity in relation to the world should be taken up and absorbed in the inclination to God, and animated by that tendency. Men compared monasticism with baptism, as a purification from sin, a renunciation of the world and regeneration to a new and higher life. It was a prevailing opinion that, by entering upon the monastic life, one was released from the obligation to make a pilgrimage, to go on a crusade, or to perform any other vow,— an opinion, grounded at bottom on the Christian view, that the ruling bent of the heart, submission to God's will, was more than external and isolated acts. "Whoever vows, when living in the world, to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, or to Rome, and after this becomes a monk," says Anselm of Canterbury,[4] "has performed all his vows at once; for single vows, signify only a partial

[1] See the account of the life of Bernard of Tiron, by one of his scholars, c. iv, Mens. April. t. ii, f. 229.

[2] Deprehendentes in se et aliis praedicantes, quia quicquid didicerant, vanitas vanitatum est et super omnia vanitas. Metalog. l. i, c. iv, of John of Salisbury.

[3] Lib. ii, ep. 29. [4] Lib. iii, ep. 116.

submission to God, with respect to a single matter; but monasticism embraces the whole. After a man has thus embraced the whole, he will not restrict himself again to individual parts."[1] An Englishman, who had set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, came to Clairvaux; and, attracted by the spiritual society which he there met with, turned monk, and gave up his pilgrimage. The abbot justified this step, in opposition to his bishop, declaring that to "*persevere in a bent of the heart towards the heavenly Jerusalem* was more than to take one hasty and transient glance of the earthly Jerusalem."[2] The abbot Peter of Cluny wrote to a knight who had promised to become a monk in Cluny, but afterwards determined to go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem: "It is greater to serve the true God in humility and poverty, than to travel in a showy and luxurious manner to Jerusalem. If there is something good in visiting Jerusalem, where the feet of our Lord have trod, still, it is a far better thing to strive after that heaven where we shall see the Lord himself, face to face."[3]

The influence of monasticism was various and widely extended. Venerated monks were called upon to give their advice with regard to the most weighty affairs. Persons of the highest standing, both of the secular and spiritual orders, noblemen and princes, got themselves enrolled as members of monasteries and monkish orders, for the purpose of sharing in the privileges of prayer and good works (*fratres adscripti* or *conscripti*); by which means these societies were brought into various influential connections. Any recluse, who had become known for his pious and strict mode of life, was soon looked up to by men of all ranks, from far and near, and was enabled by his counsels and exhortations to make himself widely useful. Such a recluse was Aybert in Hennegau, who lived near the beginning of the twelfth century. So great was the number of people continually flocking to him for the purpose of confessing their sins, that he had scarcely a moment's rest. He gave them spiritual counsel; but not till after they had promised to lay their confession before their ordinary ecclesiastical superiors. Only if they declared themselves resolved not to open their breasts to any other confessor, he yielded to their importunity, lest they might be driven to despair. At length, he received orders from the pope to hear the confessions of all, and prescribe to them the appropriate penance. Whoever could get near enough to his person tried to tear off a piece of his dress and bear it away as a relic, whilst he, resisting, exclaimed: "I am a poor sinner, and by no means what you think me to be."[4] Monks travelled about as preachers of repentance, and often collected great crowds around them, who, awakened to repentance by their impressive words and their severely strict mode of living, confessed their sins to them, and avowed their readiness to do anything they might prescribe for the reformation of their lives.

[1] Qui voverunt se ituros Romam vel Hierusalem in saeculo, si ad ordinem nostrum venerint, omnia vota sua compleverunt. Quippe qui se in partem Dei per vota tradiderant, postquam se Deo totos tradiderint, totum in partem postmodum non habent redigere. Comp. l. iii, ep. 33.

[2] Ep. 64.

[3] Lib. ii, ep. 15.

[4] Acta Sanctorum M April. t i, f. 678.

They stood to the people in place of the worldly-minded clergy, who neglected their duties. They restored peace between contending parties, reconciled enemies, and made collections for the poor. The monasteries were seats for the promotion of various trades, arts, and sciences. The gains accruing from the union of the labors of many were often employed for alleviating the distresses of many. In great famines, thousands obtained from monasteries of note the means of support, and were rescued from threatening starvation.[1]

Those, however, who took refuge in the monastery, or even in the retreat of the anchoret, from the temptations of the outward world, were still threatened by dangerous temptations of another kind, when, impelled by the first glow of their zeal, they engaged in extravagant self-mortifications. Changes in the tone of feeling would still occur even after some considerable time had been spent in this mode of life. Too deeply absorbed in their subjective feelings, they would waste themselves away in reflecting on these changeable moods. They felt dearth, emptiness, in their inward being; they failed of experiencing delight, animation in prayer. Evil thoughts gained the advantage in proportion as they allowed themselves to be troubled with them, instead of forgetting themselves in some nobler employment which would tax all the energies of the soul. Thus such men, becoming their own tormentors, fell into despair, and, unless better directed by prudent and experienced abbots, might even be tempted to commit suicide. Or moments of uncommon religious enthusiasm and fervor would be followed by a reaction of the natural man, hankering after the things of sense, or of the understanding, limited to the consciousness of this world; and hence arose moods of skepticism and unbelief.[2] There

[1] In the year 1117, when there was a great famine, by which many died of hunger, the monastery of Heisterbach, near Cologne, distributed in one day fifteen hundred alms. Meat, herbs, and bread were distributed amongst the poor. Caesar. iv., f. 65.

[2] We will illustrate this by a few examples related by Caesarius, in his Dialogues. A young female, belonging to a wealthy and reputable family, had become a recluse contrary to the wishes of her friends. But she had been deceived with regard to herself; she fell into a state of great depression, and doubted of everything which before had been certain to her. When the abbot to whose care her spiritual concerns had been intrusted by the bishop, visited her, and asked her how she did? She answered, "Not well:" and when he inquired of her the reason, she said, "She did not know herself, why she was shut up there." When he told her that it was for the sake of God and of the kingdom of heaven; she replied: "Who knows whether there is a God, whether there are angels, whether there are immortal souls, and a kingdom of heaven? Who has seen them; who has come from the other side and told us about them?" In vain were all the conversations of the abbot: she only begged that she might be released, since she could endure no longer this life of a recluse. But the abbot exhorted her to remain faithful to her purpose, and at least wait seven days longer, at the end of which period he would visit her again. Certainly, a very hazardous step to be taken with a person in her condition, which might easily have been followed with the most melancholy consequences, as appears evident from other examples. But, in this instance, the effect was favorable; and when the abbot, who in the mean time had caused many prayers to be offered in her behalf, again visited her at the time appointed, he found the tone of her feelings entirely changed. An extraordinary elevation had followed that season of depression. In a vision, which she saw while in a state of religious excitement, all her doubts had vanished away. — Another aged nun, who had previously been distinguished for her pious walk and conversation, doubted of everything she had believed from the time of her childhood. She would not be spoken to; she maintained that she could not believe, since she belonged among the reprobates. She could not be induced to take part in the holy communion. The

was much need, therefore, in the men who presided over these communities, of a peculiar love and wisdom, in order to exert a salutary control over these monks, to manage them according to their different temperaments and states of feeling, and to protect them from the dangers to which they were exposed. But when so qualified, these superiors, in exercising such a watch over the welfare of souls, might obtain a rich harvest of Christian experience. They would have first to become acquainted, by their own interior religious experience, with the truths which they afterwards used for the benefit of others. Such wisdom derived from experience we discern in an Anselm of Canterbury. To certain persons who had requested of him a directory to the spiritual life, he thus writes:[1] "On one point, namely, how you may be able to get rid of an evil will, or evil thoughts, take from me this little piece of advice. Do not contend with the evil thoughts or inclinations of the will, but get yourselves right earnestly engaged with a good thought or purpose, till those evil thoughts vanish; for, never will a thought or volition be banished out of the heart, unless it be by one of an opposite character.[2] Manage yourselves, therefore, with reference to unprofitable thoughts, so as to turn your minds with all your power of control over them to the good, so as not to pay the least attention to the others. But if you would pray, or occupy yourselves with a pious meditation, and then such thoughts become troublesome to you, still, by no means desist from your pious occupation, but vanquish them in the way described, by contempt. And, as long as you can thus despise them, let them not trouble you, lest by occasion of this anxiety they come up again, and torment you anew. For such is the nature of the human soul, that it more often recalls what has given it joy or pain, than what it judges to be unworthy of its attention.[3] Nor should you fear that such motions or thoughts will be imputed to you as sins, provided your will does not go with them; for there is no condemnation in them to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Against a mistake of this sort Bernard also strove to put his monks on the guard. "I exhort you, my friends," says he to them,[4] "to exalt yourselves sometimes above an anxious remembrance of your past conduct to a contemplation of the divine goodness, that you who are abashed by the contemplation of yourselves may breathe again by looking away to God. True, pain about sin is necessary; but it should

prior was indiscreet enough to say, for the purpose of exciting her fears, that if she did not desist from her unbelief, he would after her death cause her to be buried in the fields. To escape this lot, she threw herself into the Moselle, but was taken out before she perished. — Another person, who had from his youth up led an unblamable life, fell into absolute despair, utterly doubting that his sins were forgiven, since he could not pray as he had been wont to do: he finally threw himself into a pond and was drowned. L. c. f. 94, etc. 100.

[1] iii. 133.

[2] Nunquam enim expellitur de corde, nisi alia cogitatione et alia voluntate, quae illis non concordat.

[3] Similiter se debet habere persona in sancto proposito studiosa, in quolibet motu indecente in corpore vel anima, sicuti est stimulus carnis aut irae, aut invidiae aut inanis gloria. Tunc enim facillime extinguuntur, cum et illos velle sentire, aut de illis cogitare, aut aliquid illorum suasione facere dedignamur.

[4] See xi on Solomon's Song, ii, f. 1296.

not be a pain that lasts forever. Let it be interrupted by the more joyful remembrance of divine grace, that the heart may not become hardened by grief or wither in despair. The grace of God abounds over every sin. Hence the righteous man is not a self-accuser to the end, but only at the beginning, of prayer; but he ends with ascribing praise to God." Accordingly, he exhorted his monks, from his own experience, not to suffer themselves to be kept from prayer by any momentary feeling of spiritual barrenness. "Often we come to the altar with lukewarm, barren hearts, and address ourselves to prayer. But if we persevere, grace is suddenly poured in upon us, the heart becomes full, and a current of devotional feelings flows through the soul."[1] So he warns beginners especially against the excesses of asceticism. "It is," says he to them, "your self-will, which teaches you not to spare nature, not to listen to reason, not to follow the counsel or example of your superiors. You had a good spirit; but you do not use it rightly. I fear that you have received another instead, which, under the appearance of the good, will deceive you; and that you, who began in the Spirit, will end in the flesh. Know you not that a messenger of Satan often clothes himself as an angel of light? God is wisdom; and he requires a love which instead of surrendering itself merely to pleasant feelings, unites itself also with wisdom. Hence the apostle, Rom. 12: 1, speaks of a service of God which is reasonable. If you neglect knowledge, the spirit of error will very easily lead your zeal into wrong directions; and the cunning enemy has no surer means of banishing love from the heart, than when he can get men to walk in it improvidently and not according to reason."[2]

Those dangers of the interior life would especially beset the anchorets, who were left to their own feelings, who could find neither counsel nor encouragement in society, and could not be led back from their wanderings to the right path by the guidance of an experienced mind. Hence it was thought necessary to warn men of the dangers to which *this kind of life* was peculiarly exposed. Thus Yves, bishop of Chartres,[3] took ground against those who, puffed up by the leaven of the Pharisees, boasted of their spare diet and bodily mortifications, whereas, according to the declarations of the apostle, 1 Timoth. 4: 8, bodily exercise profiteth little; and the kingdom of God, Rom. 14: 17, consisteth not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. The solitude of groves and of mountains cannot make a man blessed, unless he brings with him that solitude of the soul, that sabbath of the heart, that elevation of the spirit, without which idleness and storms of dangerous temptation attend every solitude; and the soul never finds rest, unless God hush to silence these storms of temptation. "But if you have his grace with you," he writes, "be assured of blessedness in whatever place you may be; in whatever order, in whatever garb, you may serve God."[4] A certain

[1] In Cantica canticorum, s. x, § 7.
[2] L. c. s. xx, § 7.
[3] Ep. 192.
[4] L. c.

monk proposed to exchange the life of the convent for that of solitude; but he warned him not to do so.[1] He bid him remember that Christ left the wilderness to engage in public labors. Hence he declared the life of the anchoret inferior to that of the monastery; because in the former the man is abandoned to his self-will and his own troublesome thoughts, which disturb the quiet of the soul. This he had learned from the experience of many, who had before led a blameless life, but, after becoming anchorets, fell into lamentable aberrations. That warm and hearty devotee to the work of missions, Raymund Lull, complains of it as a great evil, that pious monks retired into solitudes, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and in preaching the gospel among the infidels. "I behold the monks," says he, "dwelling in the country and in deserts, in order to avoid the occasions of sin amongst us; I see them ploughing and cultivating the soil, in order to provide the means of support for themselves, and to supply the necessities of the poor. But, far as I can stretch my eyes and look, I can see scarcely an individual who, from love to thee, goes forward to meet the death of the martyr, as thou didst from love to us." He longs for the time, which he describes as a glorious day, when pious monks, skilled in the languages of foreign nations, shall follow the example of the apostles, and, betaking themselves amongst the infidels, stand ready to lay down their lives in preaching the faith. Thus would the holy zeal of the apostles return.[2] The abbot Peter of Cluny, writes to a recluse,[3] that "his outward separation from the world would avail him nothing, if he was destitute of the only firm bulwark against besetting sins within the soul itself. This bulwark is the Saviour. By union with him, and by following him in his sufferings, he would be safe against the attacks of all enemies, or able to repel them. Without this protection, it was not of the least use for one to shut himself up in solitude, mortify the body, or travel to foreign lands; but he would only expose himself thereby to more grievous temptations. Every mode of life, that of laymen, of clergymen, of monks, and particularly that of anchorets and recluses, has its peculiar temptations. First of all, the temptations of pride and of vanity. The anchoret takes delight in picturing to his fancy what he is by this mode of life more than others. The solitary, uniform life, in inactive repose, he cannot bear; and yet he is ashamed to abandon a mode of living which he has once chosen.[4] The repressed impulses seek room for play, therefore, in some artificial manner. Thousands flock to consult him as an oracle, and to

[1] Ep. 256.

[2] O gloriose Domine, quando erit illa benedicta Dies, in qua videam, quod sancti religiosi velint te adeo laudare, quod eant in terras exteras ad dandam laudem de tua sancta trinitate et de tua sancta unitate et de tua benedicta incarnatione et de tua gravi passione? Illa dies esset dies gloriosa, et dies, in qua rediret devotio, quam sancti apostoli habebant in moriendo pro suo Domino Jesu Christo. In the magnus liber contemplationis in Deum, opp. t. ix, f. 246.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 20.

[4] Prae taedio dormitando, ipsius miserabilis taedii non in Deo, sed in mundo, non in se, sed extra se quaerit remedium. Nam quia semel assumptum propositum eremitam deserere pudet, quaeritur occasio frequentis alieni colloquii, ut qui multa de se tacens tormenta patitur, aliorum saltem confabulationibus relevetur.

ask his advice about everything. They make confession of their sins to him, and implore his spiritual counsel. They invite him to aid them by his intercessions in a great variety of matters, and offer him presents. Thus both his ambition and his avarice are gratified. While he exhorts people to give to the poor, he may amass great treasures for himself." After the manner here described, persons who had begun as strict anchorets, might soon, through the excessive veneration which was shown them, and the numerous presents which they received, be turned away from the course which they had chosen. Many monkish institutions, governed by the strictest rule, degenerated in this way. Impostors, too, would sometimes take advantage of the popular credulity, contrive to render themselves famous, as strict anchorets, and thus make themselves rich.[1] The monks, who roved about as preachers of repentance, might produce great effects amongst the uneducated and neglected people. But when powerful compunctions, showing themselves outwardly by sensible signs, resulted from these impressions, and an excitement of this kind, accompanied with strong sensuous elements, seized irresistibly on the multitude, it required consummate wisdom to give the right direction to such a movement of the affections, so that nothing impure might intermingle, so that the sensuous element might not prevail over the spiritual, and give birth to a fanaticism which would even run into immorality, as it was said to have done in the case of a certain Robert of Arbrissel.[2] Amongst the vast multitude of monks, there were many who embraced this mode of life only for the purpose of obtaining consideration and an easy living, while they spent their time in idleness; and if, on the one hand, there were pious monks, who exerted a powerful and wholesome influence on the religious feelings and the religious education of multitudes, so there proceeded, on the other hand, from the ranks of the uneducated or hypocritical monks, active disseminators of every kind of superstition. Abelard was one who stood forth as a stern reprover of this class of monks. He describes how those who had retired from the world became corrupted by the veneration in which they were held, fell back again into the world, paid court to the rich, and, instead of speaking to their consciences, lulled them to security in their sins by teaching them to depend on their intercessions.[3] He applies to such the words in Ezek. 13: 18: " Woe to you that sew pillows

[1] Thus, it is related in the life of the abbot Stephen, of Obaize, in the province of Limousin, in the first half of the twelfth century, that a person had settled down there as an anchoret, and built himself an oratory. He gladly received whatever the people brought him, and what he could make no use of himself he converted into money. Once he appointed a day on which they were to assemble there together to hear a mass. Many came in the morning, but found him no longer there. He had absconded with all he possessed. Hence there was a want of confidence in that district, towards all who represented themselves as anchorets. See l. i, c. iv, in Baluz. Miscellan. t. iv, p. 78.

[2] See farther onward.

[3] Sint, qui longa eremi conversatione et abstinentia tantum religionis nomen adepti sunt, ut a potentioribus saeculi vel saeculariibus viris sub aliqua pietatis occasione saepius invitentur et sic diabolico cribro more paleae ventilati, de eremo removeantur in saeculo. Qui multis adulationum favoribus dona divitum venantes tam suam, quam illorum jugulant animas.

to all armholes, and make kerchiefs upon the heads of young and old, to catch souls!" "What other meaning has this, than that we pacify the consciences of worldly people by our sweet words, instead of improving their lives by our honest reproofs?"[1] In like manner Hildebert, of Mans, boldly unmasked the hypocritical monks. "Let his pale, haggard countenance," says he, "excite reverence; let him stand forth, in coarse and squalid raiment, the stern censor of manners; yet for all this he is far astray from the path that leads to life."[2] Raymund Lull, in one of his books, where he relates the wanderings of a friend of that true wisdom which begins in the love of God (*philosophia amoris*), describes[3] how, in his search after this true love, he comes to a monastery that stood in the highest reputation for piety. Rejoiced at beholding so many united together in offering praise to God, he thinks he has at last found the dwelling of true love. Soon, however, he observes a monk with a patched cowl; but he was a hypocrite; for though he fasted, preached, labored, and prayed abundantly, yet he did it only for the sake of being regarded as a saint by the others. Beside him stood another, who fasted and prayed still more. He did so, however, because he supposed that God would certainly make him so holy that he might be able to work miracles, and so be venerated as a saint after his death.[4] Here the joy of the lover of true wisdom vanished; for he could not help seeing how much he was dishonored by such conduct, who alone should command the love of all. Even that enthusiastic friend of the contemplative life of the monk, abbot Joachim, declared that while a monk who stands firm under temptations attains to the highest degree of the spiritual life, so one that yields to them becomes the worst of men. "Let a monk once become wicked," said he, "and there is not a more covetous and ambitious creature than he is."[5]

Casting a glance at the various monastic societies, which sprang up within this period, we notice, in the first place, those which derived their origin from efforts of reform amongst the clergy; and which may, therefore, be regarded as a medium of transition from the clerus to the body of monks. Among these belongs the order of Praemonstratensians, whose founder, Norbert, was born in the city of Xantes, in the dukedom of Cleves, between A. D. 1080–1085. Descended from a family of note, he lived at first after the manner of the ordinary secular clergy, sometimes at the court of the archbishop Frederic the

[1] Quid est autem pulvillos cubitis vel cervicalia capitibus supponere, nisi saecularium hominum vitam blandis sermonibus demulcere, quam nos magis asperis increpationibus oportebat corrigere. Quorum dona quum sustulerimus, eos utique de suffragio nostrarum orationum confidentes, in suis iniquitatibus relinquimus securiores. De Joanne baptista sermo, opp. Abaelardi, p. 954.

[2] Ut in eo adoretur osseus et exanguis vultus, ut sermo censorius ei sit et cultus incultior, extra viam est, quae ducit ad vitam. Ep. 11.

[3] In his Arbor philosophiae amoris, opp. t. vi, f. 56.

[4] Hoc faciebat ideo, quia habebat opinionem, quod Deum ipsum deberet facere tam sanctum, quod etiam posset facere miracula, et cum esset mortuus, quod de ipso singulis annis fieret sollenne festum.

[5] Nec putes ambitione monachum non esse tentandum, quia mortuus est mundo, quia nihil, si malus est, ambitiosius monacho, nihil avarius invenitur. In the Concordia veteris et novi testamenti, c. ii, p. 109.

First, of Cologne, sometimes at that of the emperor Henry the Fifth. But in the year 1114, being caught by a storm, while riding out for his pleasure, a flash of lightning struck near him and prostrated him to the earth. On recovering his breath and coming to his senses, he felt admonished by the thought of the sudden death from which he had been saved as by a miracle, and resolved to begin a more serious course of life. From this incident he was led to compare the history of his own conversion with that of the apostle Paul, and to represent it as partaking of the miraculous. He laid aside his sumptuous apparel for a humbler dress, and after a season of earnest spiritual preparation, entered the order of priests. In Germany and in France he itinerated as a preacher of repentance, and by his admonitions and reproofs restored peace between contending knights. He rebuked the worldly-minded clergy, and the degenerate canonical priests. By this course, however, he made himself many enemies, and was accused of preaching where he had no call to preach. He found a protector in pope Gelasius the Second, who gave him full power to preach wherever he chose. He was everywhere received with great respect. Whenever he entered the vicinity of villages or castles, and the herdsmen saw him, they left their cottages and ran to announce his arrival. As he proceeded onward the bells rang; young and old, men and women, hastened to church, where, after performing mass, he spoke the word of exhortation to the assembled people. After sermon he conversed with individuals on the concerns of the soul. Towards evening he was conducted to his lodgings, all were emulous of the honor and blessing of entertaining him as a guest. He did not take up his residence, as was customary with itinerant ecclesiastics and monks, in the church or in a monastery, but in the midst of the town, or in the castle, where he could speak to all and bestow on such as needed, the benefit of his spiritual advice. Thus he made himself greatly beloved among the people. In the year 1119, he visited pope Calixtus the Second, in Rheims, where that pope had assembled a council. This pope confirmed the full powers bestowed on him by his predecessor, and recommended him to the protection of the bishop of Laon. The latter wished to employ him as an instrument for bringing back his canonical priests to a life corresponding to their rule. But meeting here with too violent an opposition, Norbert withdrew from the field; as the bishop, however, wished to retain him in his diocese, Norbert chose a desert region in it, the wild valley of Premonstre (*Praemonstratum*, *Pratum monstratum*) in the forest of Coucy, as a suitable spot for a retreat. Such was the first foundation of a new spiritual society, which, attaching itself to the so-called rule of Augustin, aimed to unite preaching and the cure of souls with the monastic life. From this spot he travelled in every direction to preach, — to France, to Flanders, and to Germany, at the invitation of ecclesiastics, communities, and noblemen. The pious count Theobald of Champagne proposed uniting himself, and all he possessed, with the new spiritual foundation. But Norbert dissuaded him from his purpose by showing him how much good of which he might be the instrument as a prince,

would thus be prevented. "Far be it from me," said he to the count, "to harbor a wish of disturbing the work which God is doing through you." When, finally, he became archbishop of Magdeburg (1126), he sought, but not without violent opposition, to introduce his order there. He died A. D. 1134.

Norbert was one of the number also, about whom marvellous stories were circulated. But if the veneration of the multitude, and the enthusiasm of some of his disciples, attributed miracles to him, yet, the more critically examining, and we must add, inimically disposed Abelard, accuses him of ambitiously seeking after this reputation, of obtaining it by deceptive arts; and when his promises were not fulfilled, of ascribing the failure to the unbelief of others.[1]

We should here mention also, as belonging to the same age, Robert of Arbrissel. He had been carried away, in his youth, by both tendencies of the enthusiasm of his times, the scientific and the religious. After having pursued his studies with great zeal at Paris, he gained considerable celebrity by his attainments in science, and also by his strictly ascetic and pious life. The bishop of Rennes, who was possessed of a zeal for reform,—induced by the high reputation of the young man, drew him to his church, where he labored four years as priest. He attached himself to the Hildebrandian movement for the reformation of the church, and was zealous in opposing the corruption of morals in the clergy, and in upholding the severity of the laws of celibacy, and against simony. He was a forcible preacher, and his discourses produced many of those effects, which we have already noticed as attending the influential preachers of these times. After the death of his bishop, he betook himself to the solitary life. His reputation attracted to him numbers of both sexes, who wished to train themselves under his direction in the way of spiritual living. Pope Urban the Second conferred on him the dignity of apostolic preacher, by virtue of which he might travel about everywhere and call sinners to repentance, and restore peace between contending parties. He exercised an astonishing power over men and women. Vicious persons were so influenced by it, as to make full confession of their sins to him, and promise amendment. Others, who had led an upright life in the world, were persuaded wholly to forsake it. Such, for example, was the effect produced by the society of this man on the mother of the famous abbot Peter of Cluny, who entertained him for a while in

[1] Thus, when others told of Norbert, that, not long before his death, he called the dead to life, Abelard ridiculed his vain attempts to raise the dead. Ad majora illa veniam et summa illa miracula de resuscitandis quoque mortuis inaniter tentata. Quod quidem nuper praesumsisse Norbertum et coapostolum ejus Farsitum mirati fuimus et risimus. Qui diu pariter in oratione coram populo prostrati et de sua praesumtione frustrati, cum a proposito confusi decederent, objurgare populum, impudenter coeperunt, quod devotioni suae et constanti fidei fidelitas eorum obsisteret. Sermo de Joanne baptista, p. 967. It is worthy of note, that the Praemonstrant who wrote Norbert's life, makes no mention of his having raised the dead, and that in his prologue he declares: Many things must be passed over on account of the infideles et impii, qui quidquid legunt et audiunt, quod ab eorum studiis et conversationibus sit alienum, falsum continuum et confictum esse judicare non metuunt, ea duntaxat breviter attingens, quae omnibus nota sunt neque ipsi ulla improbitate audeant diffiteri. Acta Sanctor. Mens. Jun. t. i, f. 819.

her house. She secretly vowed that she would become a nun, and resolved to execute her vow as soon as her husband died, or would permit her to do so.[1] It was said of his sermons, that every individual who heard them, felt the words to be aimed at himself as much as if they were addressed to him personally and with design.[2] There was formed under his direction a religious society composed of persons of both sexes, and of ecclesiastics and laymen, whom he denominated the *Pauperes Christi*. His admirers were disposed to regard the moral effects that resulted from his labors as something beyond miracles; and it deserves notice that, although he produced such powerful impressions by his preaching, yet during his lifetime not a single miracle was ascribed to him,— the reason of which may doubtless be found in the peculiar spirit of his labors; for on this point, the enthusiastic admirer who wrote his life, says, that miracles wrought within men's souls are more than those performed on their bodies.[3] The enduring monument of his activity was the order of nuns at Fontevraud (Fons Ebraldi), a convent not far from the town of Candes in Poitou. It is impossible to mistake the marks which show that this man was actuated by a glowing zeal for the salvation of souls; though we must confess that, as in the case of many powerful preachers of times so given to the eccentric, his zeal may not have been accompanied with a spirit of prudence, nor exempt from fanatical excesses; and some of the bad effects which attached themselves to the great results of his labors, may doubtless have proceeded from these causes. His enthusiastic admirers will not allow us, it is true, to perceive any mixture of lights and shades in the picture they have drawn of him; but the way in which the abbot Gottfried of Vendôme, and bishop Hildebert of Mans, or Marbod of Rennes, describe his labors, contain features too characteristic to leave it possible for us to conceive that they should have been pure inventions, and they moreover agree with other kindred examples of these times.[4] If the squalid raiment in which he travelled about as a preacher of repentance, contributed to procure for him the reverence of the multitude, — and he is said to

[1] Words of the abbot Peter of Cluny, concerning his mother: Famoso illi Roberto de Brussello ad se venienti et secum aliquamdiu moranti impulsa violento aestu animi se in monacham ignorante viro redderet, ut eo defuncto vel concedente statim ad fontem Ebraudi, si viveret, demigraret. Epp. l. ii, ep. 17.

[2] Bishop Baldric, in the account of his life, at the 25th of February, c. iv, § 23: Tantam praedicationis gratiam ei Dominus donaverat, ut cum communem sermocinationem populo faceret, unusquisque quod sibi conveniebat, acciperet.

[3] This is evident, from the beautiful words in the account of his life, c. iv, § 23: Ego audenter dico, Robertum in miraculis copiosum, super daemones imperiosum, super principes gloriosum. Quis enim nostri temporis tot languidos curavit, tot leprosos mundavit, tot mortuos suscitavit? Qui de terra est, de terra loquitur et miracula in corporibus admiratur. Qui autem spiritualis est, languidos et leprosos, mortuos quoque convaluisse testatur, quando quilibet animabus languidis et leprosis suscitandis consulit et medetur.

[4] Even if the persons mentioned were not the authors of these letters, if one or the other of them was written by Roscelin, a truth of this kind may have been lying at bottom. This Roscelin, when a canonical priest, was an adversary of Robert of Arbrissel, who seemed desirous of transforming the regular clergy into monks. Abelard says of him (ep. 21): Hic contra egregium illum praeconem Christi Robertum de Arbrosello contumacem ausus es epistolam confingere.

have given it himself as a reason for wearing them, that they drew more veneration from the simple; yet there were others who blamed him for attempting to distinguish himself in this way, and complained that he did not dress according to his station, as a canonical ecclesiastic and priest. They styled it only a species of vanity, and assured him that, to reasonable people, he must appear like a crazy man.[1] By censuring the worldly-minded clergy, in which he followed altogether the spirit of the Hildebrandian party, he drew after him the multitude, who delighted in such things. On the other hand, it is said in the letter above noticed, "of what use is it to censure the absent? So far from being of any use, it must seem to his ignorant hearers, as if he gave them liberty thereby to sin,—holding up to them, as he does, the example of their superiors, whose authority they might plead. By such censures, the absent would rather be excited to indignation than persuaded to amendment. Of some advantage, however, it was perhaps, to himself, to make every other order of the church contemptible in the eyes of the multitude, so that he and his followers might stand alone in their esteem. Such cunning, however, savors of the old man; it is something diabolical. It accords not with his calling, with his itinerant wanderings, with the squalid dress he wears. The congregations leave their priests, whom they are taught to look upon as worthless; they despise their intercessions, and will no longer submit to church penance from them; will no longer pay them tithes and firstlings. To him and his followers they flock in crowds; and to him and his, pay the honor which they owe to their own priests. Yet these poor people are not influenced by the love of religion, but manifestly by that love of novelty, which is ever a ruling passion with the multitude;[2] for nobody can perceive any amendment in their lives." It was now objected to him generally, that he placed too much reliance on momentary feelings of compunction, and made no further inquiry into the temper of those on whom his discourses had produced an effect. He was accused of saying, that he was satisfied could he prevent a man from sinning, even for a single night. He was accused of accepting at once every man, who, after some such superficial impression, expressed a wish to retire from the world. Hence, people of this class fell afterwards into a worse state than ever. He was accused of a pharisaical zeal to make proselytes. "So great is the number of his disciples," said these adversaries, "that they may be seen with their long beards and their black dresses, running in troops

[1] Ep. Marbod. among the letters of Hildebert, f. 1408: De pannosi habitus insolentia plurimi te redarguendum putant, quoniam nec canonicae professioni, sub qua militare coepisti, nec sacerdotali ordini, in quem promotus es, convenire videtur. Est enim singulis quibusque professionibus sive ordinibus apta quaedam et congrua distinctio habenda, quae si permutetur, publicum offendit judicium. Videamus ergo, ne ista, per quae admirationem parare volumus, ridicula et odiosa sint. That he went about in a cowl full of holes, barefoot, and with a long beard, as a novel sight for all, ut ad ornatum lunatici solam tibi jam clavam deesse loquantur. Haec tibi non tam apud simplices, ut dicere soles, auctoritatem, quam apud sapientes furoris suspicionem comparant.

[2] Quos tamen, ut manifestum est, non religionis amor, sed ea, quae semper vulgo familiaris est, curiositas et novorum cupiditas ducit.

through the provinces; wearing shoes in the country, going barefoot in the towns and villages. And if these people are asked, why they do so, the only reply they have to make is, 'They are the people of the Master.'" Especially was he censured for his manner of operating upon the female sex; for his too free intercourse with them, and for his renovation of the dangerous fanaticism of the *subintroductae*.[1] He is said to have allowed himself to be influenced in his conduct towards the female sex too much by whim and caprice; to some, being too lenient; to others, too severe; imposing on them too harsh modes of penance. Gottfried of Vendôme, — who intimates, however, that this charge against Robert of Arbrissel came by no means from credible sources,[2] — represents to him how tenderly the weaker sex should be dealt with; how easily many might by his mode of treatment be reduced to despair.[3]

We noticed, at the close of the preceding period, the origin of the order of Cluny; and we have described the high consideration it attained through the merits of the men who stood at its head. In the beginning of this period, the friend of Gregory the Seventh, abbot Hugo, joined himself to it; but so much the more mischievous in its influence on the order was the bad administration of his successor, Pontius, who was finally obliged, in the year 1122, to resign his post. Soon afterwards the place was filled by one who is to be numbered among the most distinguished men of the church in his times, the abbot Peter Mauritius, to whom even his contemporaries gave the title of Venerable. By him, the order was once more raised to distinction. He was descended from a family of consideration in Auvergne, and is to be reckoned among the many great men of the church on whose development the influence of Christian training, by pious mothers, had a lasting effect. The character of his mother, who later in life became a nun, was delineated by his own pen with filial affection, soon after her death.[4] Under him the order took a different direction from that in which it had originated. As this man, distinguished for his amiable and gentle spirit, strongly sympathized with everything purely human, so, under his guidance, the monastery, before consecrated alone to rigid asceticism, became a seat also of the arts and sciences.[5] A Christian delicacy of feeling, far removed from the sternness and excess which we elsewhere find in monasticism, forms a characteristic trait in the character of this individual. To a prior, who was not disposed to relax in the least from the zeal of an over-rigid asceticism, he wrote: "God accepts no sacrifices which are offered to him contrary to his own appointed order." He held up to him the example of Christ: "The devil invited Christ to cast himself down

[1] Συνείσακτοι, vol. i, 277, and vol. ii, 149.

[2] *Quod si ita est*, iv, 46.

[3] Fragilis est multum et delicatus sexus femineus et idcirco necesse est, ut pietatis dulcedine potius quam nimia severitate regatur, ne forte abundantiori tristitia absorbeatur, et qui eum regere debet, sic a satana circumveniatur.

[4] Lib. ii, ep. 17.

[5] Lib. iii, ep. 7. He praises a monk who diligently devoted himself to scientific studies: Monachum longe melius Cluniaci, quam quemlibet philosophum in academia philosophantem stupeo.

from the pinnacle of the temple; but he who came to give his life for the salvation of the world, refused to end it by a suicidal act,—thereby setting an example, which admonishes us that we are not to push the mortification of the body to self-destruction.[1] So Paul, also (1 Timothy 5: 23), following the example of Christ, exhorts his disciple, that he should provide for his body with moderation, not that he should destroy it." He blames him for not heeding the affectionate remonstrances of the pious brethren amongst his inferiors. "When a man pays no regard to those who speak such words of love, he despises the love itself which prompted such words. And he who despises love, can have none himself. But of what avail is all the fasting in the world, and all mortifications of the flesh, to him who has no love? (1 Cor. 13.) Abstain, then, from flesh and from fish; push thy abstinence as far as thou wilt; torture thy body, allow no sleep to thine eyes; spend the night in vigils, the day in toils; still, whether willing or unwilling, thou must hear the apostle: 'Even if thou givest thy body to be burned, it profits thee nothing.'" Far removed from this monkish estrangement from humanity, he was aware that the suppression of man's natural feelings stood at variance with the essence of Christianity; on which point he thus expresses himself in a beautiful letter to his brother, on the occasion of their mother's death: "The feelings of nature, sanctified by Christianity, should be allowed their rights in the free shedding of tears. Paul (1 Thess. 4: 13), does not object to sorrow generally, but only to the sorrow of unbelief, the sorrow which contends against Christian hope."[2] To a monk, who thought himself bound to keep away from his native country, lest he should be attracted by some earthly tie, he wrote:[3] "If pious men must abhor their country, Job would not have remained in his; the devout Magians would not have returned to theirs; our Lord himself would not have rendered his own illustrious by his miracles. The pious, then, are not obliged to fly from their country, but only from its customs, if they are bad. Neither ought the good man to fly from his relations and friends, from fear of the contamination of wickedness; rather, he should endeavor to win them to salvation by wholesome admonitions; he should not be afraid of their earthly affections, but rather seek to communicate to them his own heavenly affections. I myself," said he, "would gladly retire into solitude; but, if it is not granted me, or until it is granted me, let us follow the example of him who, amidst the crowd, in royal banquets, and surrounded by gilded walls, could say, he dwelt in solitude (Ps. 55: 8, according to the Vulgate). And such a solitude we can construct in the recesses of the heart, where alone the true solitude is found by true despisers of the world,—where no stranger finds admittance; where, without bodily utterance, is heard in gentle murmurs the voice of our dis-

[1] Ut doceret, utiliter quidem carnem esse mortificandam, sed non more homicidarum crudeliter perimendam.

[2] Non noster talis dolor, quem generat non fidei defectus, sed nulla lege prohibitus mutuae germanitatis affectus. Non noster talis fletus, quem fundimus, non futurorum desperatione, sed naturae compassione.

[3] Lib. ii, ep. 22.

coursing Master. In this solitude, let us, my dearest son, so long as we are in the body, and dwell as strangers on the earth,— even in the midst of tumults,—take refuge; and what we would seek in distant countries, find in ourselves; for the kingdom of God is indeed in us." His letters evidence the intimate communion of spirit which he cherished with those of kindred disposition amongst the monks. Thus he writes to one of them: "When I would search with thee into the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, thou didst always come and join me with the greatest delight. When I would converse with thee on matters of worldly science, though still under the guidance of divine grace, I found in thee a ready mind and an acute discernment. O, how often, with the doors shut,— and him alone for our witness who is never absent where thought and discourse dwell on him, has awful converse been held by us, on the blindness and hardness of man's heart; on the various entanglements of sin, on the manifold snares of wicked spirits, on the abyss of the divine judgments; how have we, with fear and trembling, adored him in his counsels respecting the children of men,— when we considered, that he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and hardens whom he will; and that no man knows, whether he deserves love or hatred; on the uncertainty of our calling;[1] when we meditated on the economy of salvation, by the incarnation and sufferings of the Son of God; on the dreadful day of the last judgment!"[2] With great boldness, he told even the popes their faults. Thus he wrote to Eugene the Third:[3] "Though you have been set by God over the nations, in order to root out and to pull down, to build and to plant (Jerem. 1: 10); still, because you are neither God, nor the prophet to whom this was said, you may be deceived, betrayed, by those who seek only their own. For this reason, a faithful son, who would put you on your guard against such dangers, is bound to make known to you what has been made known to him, and what you perhaps may still remain ignorant of."

When the Cluniacensian order had thus departed from its ancient austerity, and when milder principles prevailed in the Benedictine monasticism generally, there sprung up, out of a certain tendency to reform, an enterprise by which the strictness of the older models was to be again revoked to life. *Robert*, who came from a noble family in Champagne, had, in his childhood, been presented by his parents as an *oblatus* to a monastery. But as monasticism nowhere came up to his high requisitions, he joined himself to a society of anchorets, who led a strict life in the forest of Moslesme. The high consideration which this society attained to by its strict mode of living, procured for it unsought rich gifts; and the increase of earthly goods was followed as usual by relaxation. Hence Robert, together with twenty of the most zealous of these recluses, was induced to separate from the rest. With his companions he retired to a lonely district, called Citeaux (Cistercium), in the bishopric of Chalons, not far from

[1] We perceive here the influence of the Augustinian doctrine.

[2] Lib. ii. ep. 22.

[3] Lib. vi, ep. 12.

Dijon. Here was formed, sometime after the year 1098, a society of monks, over which Robert presided. But he could not carry his work here to its full completion; for the monks of Moslesme contrived to obtain an order from pope Urban the Second, by virtue of which the abbot Robert was obliged to return, and assume the direction of that monastery. He left his disciple Alberic at the head of the new establishment. Pope Paschalis the Second, confirmed the rule of the new monastic order, which had been drawn up after the Benedictine rule, but with greater severity. The new monasteries presented a picture of the extremest poverty, and in this respect stood in striking contrast with the monasteries of Cluny, which in some cases were distinguished for the embellishments of art. The defenders of the hitherto current form of the Benedictine monasticism objected, however, to the abbot Robert that he clung tenaciously to the letter of the Benedictine rule as the Jews to the letter of the law;[1] and they maintained, in opposition to him, that the strictness of ancient monasticism had been properly modified, with a due reference to the difference of climate.[2] Under the third abbot of Citeaux, Stephen Harding, this new order of monks had but few members left, its excessive severity having frightened numbers away. It was first by means of an extraordinary man, who belonged amongst the most influential of his times, that this order attained to higher consideration, and became more widely spread. This was the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, whose spirit, life, and labors we must here consider more in detail.

Bernard was born in the year 1091, at Fontaines, in Burgundy, not far from Dijon. His father was a respectable knight; and on his education, as in so many other cases, a pious mother, Aleth, exerted the greatest influence. All her seven children, six sons and a daughter, she brought, as soon as they saw the light, to the altar, and consecrated to God. The third of these sons, Bernard, already exhibited while a child a predominant religious bent, which, under the influence of such a mother, developed itself at a very early period.[3] After the death of his mother, the young man fell into a kind of society by which he was drawn away from that earlier bent. Yet this had been too deeply ingrained into his disposition not to put forth in the end a mightier reaction against all the impressions made on him at a later period, and he determined to break loose from all worldly ties and become a monk. His brothers, not pleased with this design, tried to dissuade him from it, and to counteract the love of monasticism by another of the nobler tendencies of these times, the enthu-

[1] See the words of the worthy English Benedictine, Ordericus Vitalis, Hist. eccles. l. viii, f. 713, where, speaking of those who retired with Robert to Cistercium, he says: Qui sancti decreverant regulam Benedicti, sicut Judaei legem Mosis ad literam servare penitus.

[2] Orderic. Vital. hist. eccles. l. viii, f. 712.

[3] Suffering when a lad under severe headaches, a woman came to him, and promised to cure him by incantations and amulets; but he repelled her proposal with great indignation. Once, on Christmas-eve, he was at church, and having waited longer than usual for the commencement of service, fell asleep, and had a vision of Christ, who appeared to him as a child. See the account of Bernard's life by one of his disciples, the abbot William, in Mabillon, l. i, c. ii, § 4.

siasm for science, which now began to manifest itself, especially in France. This attempt was not altogether unsuccessful; but the memory of his mother revived in him the impressions of his childhood; he often saw in fancy her image before him, and heard her admonishing voice. Once, when on his way to pay a visit to his brother, who was a knight, and then engaged in beleaguering a castle,—he was so overwhelmed with these recollections as to feel constrained to enter a church, on the road, where, with a flood of tears, he poured out his heart before God, and, solemnly consecrating himself to his service, resolved to execute the above-mentioned plan of life. And it is characteristic of the man, that he chose at once as his ideal the strictest monasticism of this period, by which so many others were frightened away from it. By the invincible fervor of his zeal, which expressed itself in the force of his language and in his whole demeanor, several of his relatives and friends, and all his brothers except the youngest, who was still a child,[1] were immediately carried away, and induced to join him in his resolution. In the year 1113, he entered, with thirty companions, into the monastery of Citeaux.

He was a monk with his whole soul. In bodily labors as well as in spiritual exercises, he sought to come fully up to the ideal of the monastic life. He himself was compelled afterwards to lament that, in the first years of his life as a monk, he had so enfeebled his body by excessive asceticism, as to find himself afterwards disqualified for completely fulfilling the duties of his station.[2] But his wide and diversified labors show to what extent the energy of a mind actuated by a sense of the highest interests could find ways of making even so frail a vessel serviceable, and of overcoming the obstacles of a sickly constitution.[3] And, in these times, his very looks, which bore the marks of this rigid self-discipline, only created for him the greater respect. The fiery energy, with which he spoke and acted, contrasted with the weakness of his bodily frame, only produced so much the mightier effects.[4]

In the three years during which he remained at Citeaux, he gained in this way so high a reputation, that at the early age of five and twenty he was placed himself at the head of a monastery. In a desert and

[1] The following incident illustrates one characteristic feature in the life of this period. The eldest of these brothers, Guido, happening to see the youngest, Nivard, playing with other boys in the street, called out to him, and said: "You are now owner of all our property." To which the lad replied, "What! *you* have heaven, and *I* the earth? That is no equitable division."

[2] In the account of his life already cited (c. viii, § 41), it is said of him: Non confunditur usque hodie se accusare, sacrilegii arguens semetipsum, quod servitio Dei et fratrum abstulerit corpus suum, dum indiscreto fervore imbecille illud reddiderit ac paene inutile.

[3] When, during the schism under pope Innocent the Third, he was under the necessity of journeying to Italy: Instantissima postulatione imperatoris apostolicoque mandato nec non ecclesiae ac principum precibus flexi dolentes ac nolentes, debiles atque infirmi, et, ut verum fateor, pavidae mortis pallidam circumferentes imaginem, trahimur in Apuliam. Ep. 144, § 4.

[4] In the first account of his life, l. c.: Quis nostra aetate, quantumvis robusti corporis et accuratae valetudinis tanta aliquando fecit, quanta iste facit et facit moribundus et languidus ad honorem Dei et sanctae ecclesiae utilitatem? And from immediate observation, his biographer could say: Virtus Dei vehementius in infirmitate ejus refulgens extunc usque hodie digniorem quandam apud homines ei efficit reverentiam et in reverentia auctoritatem et in auctoritate obedientiam.

wild valley inclosed by mountains, lying within the bishopric of Langres, which, in earlier times, having been a nest of robbers, was called the Valley of Wormwood (*Vallis absinthialis*), and afterwards, when cleared of them, Clear Valley (*Clara vallis*), it was proposed to found a new monastery of Cistercians; and this, from its location, received the name of Claravallis, or Clairvaux. Bernard was made abbot of it in the year 1115, and this monastery became now the chief seat of his multifarious labors, which extended abroad from this point through the whole of Europe. From that time, men of all ranks and stations, knights and scholars, were attracted to the Cistercian order. The strictness which had hitherto kept back so many, now acted as a charm on others. Monasteries after the pattern of Clairvaux sprang up in the deserts, whose very names were intended to denote what the interior life could gain in them.[1] Within thirty-seven years, the number of convents subordinate to the abbot of Citeaux was increased to sixty-seven.

Under Bernard's direction, the above-named monastery, situated in an uncultivated region, earned so much by the hard labor of the monks, that during a severe famine in Burgundy, when crowds of famishing poor poured in from all quarters to the gates of the convent, two thousand selected from the multitude, and marked by a peculiar badge attached to their persons, were supplied for several months with all they needed for their sustenance, while others at the same time received indiscriminate alms.[2] The monastery of Clairvaux became the model of monasticism; and colonies from it, to found other establishments after the same pattern, were demanded from all quarters; so that the abbot Bernard sometimes found himself unable to comply with all the invitations that were sent to him. To all parts of France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, England, Ireland, Denmark, and Sweden, monks must be sent from Clairvaux for the purpose of founding new monasteries or of reforming old ones;[3] and thus Bernard, at his death, in 1153, left behind him one hundred and sixty monasteries, which had been formed under his influence. Hence he had connections and correspondents with all these countries; and the establishments which had thus arisen ever regarded him as their father and teacher. Hence his letters and his influence would be widely diffused through all these lands. He was the counsellor of noblemen, bishops, princes, and popes. As we have seen, he was often summoned to their assistance, to settle disputes, to quiet disturbances; insomuch that he was constrained to lament over the little opportunity that was

[1] Ordericus Vitalis, the friend of the old man, says: Multi nobiles athletae et profundi sophistae ad illos pro novitate singularitatis concurrerunt et inusitatam districtionem ultro complexantes in via recta laeti Christo hymnos laetitiae modulati fuerunt. In desertis atque silvestribus locis monasteria proprio labore condiderunt et sacra illis nomina solenti provisione imposuerunt, ut est Domus Dei, Claravallis, Bonus mons, et eleemosyna et alia plura hujusmodi, quibus auditores solo nominis nectare invitantur festinanter experiri, quanta sit ibi beatitudo, quae tam speciali denotetur vocabulo. Hist. eccles. l. viii, f. 714

[2] See the account of the life of John Eremita the Second, 6, in his works, ed. Mabillon, f. 1287.

[3] See the second account of his life by Bernald, iv, 26, and the third, vii, 22.

left him, in the multiplicity of external business, to lead the kind of life which became a monk.[1] The general enthusiasm demanded him for bishop in many of the more important cities,—such as Langres, Chalons sur Marne, Rheims, Genoa, and Milan; but he declined every such invitation.[2] Before princes and nobles he stood up as an advocate for the unfortunate, and for the victims of injustice; he stimulated those who attached themselves to his person, to benevolent enterprises; and directed them in such undertakings by his counsel. Amongst the latter belonged particularly the count Theobald of Champagne. He directed that nobleman in establishing a fund for the support of poor people, the interest of which should go on continually increasing, and thus secure a permanent and accumulating capital for relieving the wants of the needy.[3] Although a religious interest, based on his view of the church theocracy, as we have unfolded it on a former page, induced him to enter the lists in defence of the papal authority; and, although he was a zealous instrument in promoting the higher objects of the popes; yet he was no advocate of a blind obedience to them, and boldly exposed to them the wicked acts perpetrated in their name, so that his interference in public affairs was sometimes extremely irksome to the more important personages near the papal court. Strongly as he recommended in general, as a monk, obedience to superiors, yet he also declared himself opposed to too broad an interpretation of this duty. "Were a blind and implicit obedience, submitted to without examination, to become the general rule," says he, "the words we hear read at church: 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good,' would be without meaning. We should have to expunge from the gospel the words: 'be wise as serpents,' and retain only, 'be harmless as doves.' True, I do not say that the commands of superiors ought to be examined by subordinates, where nothing is commanded which is contrary to the divine law; but I affirm that *wisdom* is also necessary to detect whatever may be commanded contrary to those laws; and *freedom* to regard every such command with contempt.[4] Say, suppose one should place a sword in your hand, and bid you point it against his own throat, would you obey him? Or, if he bid you plunge into the flames or into the flood? Would you not be yourself a partaker of the crime, were it in your power to prevent another from so doing and you failed to exert it?"[5] This principle, he applies, in the letter where it is expressed, to the relation of men to the pope; and he sets the command of Christ, the high-priest of all, over against such a supposed command of the pope. His own conduct was ever in accordance with this principle. He shrunk not from writing to Innocent the Second, that the popes themselves had contributed most to injure their

[1] Amici, qui me quotidie de claustro ad civitates pertrahere moliuntur. Ep. 21.

[2] See the second account of his life by Bernald, iv, 26.

[3] L. c. viii, 52. Eleemosynas ea sagacitate disponere, ut semper fructificantes redivivis et renascentibus accessionibus novas semper eleemosynas parturirent.

[4] Nec dico, a subditis mandata praepositorum esse dijudicanda, ubi nihil juberi deprehenditur divinis contrarium institutis, sed necessariam assero et prudentiam, qua advertatur, si quid adversatur et libertatem, qua et ingenue contemnatur.

[5] Ep. 7, § 12.

own authority, by abusing it.[1] "It was the unanimous voice of all who presided over the communities with a sincere regard for their well-being, that justice in the church was falling to decay; the power of the keys reduced to nothing; the episcopal authority losing all respect;—since no bishop was allowed to punish wickedness in his own diocese, and this, owing to the action of the pope and the Roman court; for, men said, whatever good thing the bishop may devise, it is sure to be frustrated there; whatever evil they have rightly removed, is sure to be again introduced. All the vicious, the quarrelsome who have been expelled by them from the communities, from the body of the clergy, or of the monks, run up to Rome and boast of the protection which they there find."[2]

We have already spoken of the great power exercised by Bernard over the minds of men, when, in the name of pope Eugene, he preached up the crusade in France and Germany. Though at that time many deceptions, whether intentional or undesigned, were mixed in,[3] under the name of miraculous cures, yet we cannot suppose the former in the case of such a man as Bernard; and unintentional deception would not suffice to explain the general belief of Bernard's miraculous powers, nor the several stories so circumstantially narrated.[4] Whether it was that the confident faith excited by the strong impression which this extraordinary man everywhere made produced so great effects, and the religious susceptibility of the times, in which the element of a critical understanding was so repressed by that of immediate religious feeling, came to his assistance; or, whether he possessed some natural,

[1] Quid vobis vires minuitis? Quid robur vestrum deprimitis? Ep. 178.

[2] Quique flagitiosi et contentiosi de populo, sive de clero aut ex monasteriis pulsati currunt ad vos, redeuntes jactant et gestiunt, se obtinuisse tutores, quos magis ultores sensisse debuerant.

[3] Abelard, who with critical understanding examined into the tales of miraculous cures in his times, speaks of it: Non ignoramus astutias talium, qui cum febricitantes a lenibus morbis curare praesumunt, pluribus aliqua vel in cibo vel in potu tribuunt, ut curent, vel benedictiones vel orationes faciunt. Hoc utique cogitant, ut si quoquomodo curatio sequatur, sanctitati eorum imputetur. Sin vero minime, infidelitati eorum (i. e. of those on whom the cure had been performed) vel desperationi adscribatur. De Joanne baptista, opp. p. 967.

[4] Concerning a boy born blind, to whom he restored sight, in the district of Liege, we find the following account by the monk Gottfried, of Clairvaux, in l. iv, vi, 34. Transported at the first ray of light, to him before wholly unknown, the boy cried out "I see day, I see everybody, I see people with hair," and, clapping his hands for joy, he exclaimed, "My God, now I shall no more dash my feet against the stones!" In Cambray, he cured a deaf and dumb boy; and, as soon as he could speak, the multitude set him on a wooden bench, that he might salute the people with his new gift of speech, and his first words were received with a shout of joy. This monk relates still another case of which he was an eye-witness, l. c. § 39 (e plurimis sane, quae in ejusdem apostolici viri facta sunt comitatu, duo scribimus, quae nos oblivisci ipsa, quam vidimus magnitudo laetitiae non permittit). At Charlerie, a country-town, not far from the city of Provins, a boy ten years old, who had been for a year so lame in all his limbs as to be unable to move a single member, not even his head, was presented to him, as he passed along the street, by the lad's parents and other relations. Bernard touched him, and signed the cross over him; when, at his bidding, he rose up and walked. The lad was now unwilling to leave his benefactor who had given him the use of his limbs, till Bernard obliged him to do so. His younger brother embraced him, as if he had been restored from the dead, and many were moved to tears. Four years afterwards, his mother brought him again to Bernard, as he happened to be passing through the town a second time; and she bade her son kiss his feet, saying to him, "This is the man who restored life to *you* and you to *me*."

magnetic power of healing (a supposition which I see no reasons for adopting); the fact was, Bernard himself avowed the conviction, that God did perform miracles by him; as, for example, in that letter to pope Eugene the Third, already quoted, where he refers to what he had accomplished in rousing up Europe to engage in the crusade.[1] So, after fighting down the heretics in the south of France, he appeals, in a letter to the citizens of Toulouse, to the fact,[2] that he had revealed among them the truth, not merely by word, but also by power.[3] As solitary workings of that higher power of life which Christ introduced into human nature, these facts might perhaps be properly regarded, wherever they appeared in connection with a genuinely Christian temper, actuated by the spirit of love. Evidence for this reason in favor of the entire truth of the doctrines promulgated, they at the same time certainly were not; for that higher power of life, whose fountain-head is union with Christ, does not necessarily exclude errors; and, moreover, the supposed miracles may have belonged to the Old Testament position of this period.

Still there were, even then, persons who, in the conflict with the prevailing spiritual tendencies of their times, doubted or denied the truth of those miraculous stories; persons, to be sure, who cannot be regarded as unprejudiced witnesses, — who were not at all less biased than his enthusiastic admirers, though on a different side, — the representatives of that critical bent of the understanding which was most directly opposed to the spirit of Bernard, — Abelard and his disciples. These seem not to have acknowledged Bernard's miraculous gifts. Abelard, it is true, in a passage already quoted,[4] does not speak of *his* miracles, precisely after the same manner in which he does of the miracles of others, which he directly pronounces a delusion; nor does he mention him by name. But proceeding as he does on the general assumption that miracles were no longer wrought in his age, he seems to make no exception of the case of Bernard; — and the way in which Abelard's talented but haughty disciple, Berengar, expresses himself, would lead us to infer from the whole tone of his remarks, though he nowhere disputes the truth of those miraculous stories, yet his own incredulity with regard to them.[5]

He himself, for that matter, was far from over-estimating the value of such miraculous gifts, which he describes as something rare in this time and difficult of attainment. He advises that men should rather bend all their efforts in striving after those *Christian virtues* without which the church cannot exist, and, above all, *charity*, than to be very anxious after *these* things, — which served only as an ornament to the

[1] Page 157.

[2] Ep. 242.

[3] Veritate nimirum per nos manifestata non solum in sermone, sed etiam in virtute.

[4] Page 256.

[5] He says, manifestly with sarcasm, Jamdudum sanctitudinis tuae odorem ales per orbem fama dispersit, praeconizavit merita, miracula declamavit. Felicia jactabamus moderna saecula tam corusci sideris venustata nitore mundumque jam debitum perditioni tuis meritis subsistere putabamus. Sperabamus in linguae tuae arbitrio coeli sitam clementiam, aëris temperiem, ubertatem terrae, fructuum benedictionem. Sic diu vixisti, ut ad semicinctia tua rugire daemones autumaremus et beatulos nos tantulo gloriaremur patrono

church, — which were not necessary to salvation, and which were attended with many dangers.[1]

Connected with Bernard's participation in the crusades, was the part he took also in an undertaking designed for the promotion of the same object, the *order of Knight Templars*. This order of spiritual knights had been already founded nine years, but consisted of only eighteen members; when, through Bernard's coöperation, it received a newly modified rule, at the council of Troyes, in 1127, and Bernard's participation in it gave the whole affair a new impulse. In compliance with the wish of its first master, Hugo de Paganis, he wrote a discourse of exhortation and encouragement for the use of the members: "Exhortatio ad milites templi." He extols this order as a combination of monasticism and knighthood, contrasting it with the common knighthood, which was only subservient to wicked ends, and inspired by sinful desires and passions. He describes the design of it as being to give the military order and the knighthood a serious Christian direction, and to convert war into something which God might approve. "Even infidels," says he, "should not be put to death, if in any other way they could be prevented from persecuting and oppressing Christians;"[2] and, as in favor of the crusades generally, so also in favor of this order of knights devoted to the same object, he makes it a prominent argument, that Christendom would thereby be relieved from a multitude of mischievous men, that these men would be called to repentance and rendered serviceable to the church.[3]

What preëminently distinguished this great man was, that to a bent of mind profoundly contemplative, a rich inward experience, he united such a many-sided activity directed on the outward world. As in his own case religious knowledge proceeded from interior experience, so he endeavored to guide his disciples and contemporaries to this fountain-head of the knowledge of divine things, as opposed to a predominantly scientific direction of the Christian mind.[4] Monasticism was so highly valued by him, because he considered it a school for this theology of the heart. Thus he wrote to a scholastic theologian, whom he invited to become a monk.[5] "Thou, who busiest thyself with the study of the prophets, understandest thou what thou readest? If thou dost understand it, then thou knowest that the sense of the prophets is Christ. And, if thou wouldst have him, know that thou wilt succeed far better by following him, than by reading. Why seekest thou in the word *that Word*, which stands already before thine eyes as the

[1] Istiusmodi ligna in opus laquearium ad decorem Domus Dei (quae magis noscuntur apta ornatui, quam necessaria fore saluti), quoniam istiusmodi ligna constat et laboriose quaeri et difficile inveniri et periculose elaborari (nam et rara ea praesertim his temporibus terra nostra producere reperitur). Sermo xlvi, in Cantica canticor. § 8.

[2] Non quidem vel pagani necandi essent, si quo modo aliter possent a nimia infestatione seu oppressione fidelium cohiberi. ii, 4.

[3] Quodque cernitur jucundius et agitur commodius, paucos admodum in tanta multitudine hominum illo conflare videas, nisi utique sceleratos et impios, raptores et sacrilegos, homicidas, perjuros et adulteros. Sic Christus, sic novit ulcisci in hostem suos, ut non solum de ipsis, sed per ipsos quoque frequenter soleat tanto gloriosius, quanto et potentius triumphare, § 10.

[4] Which we shall describe more exactly in the fourth section.

[5] Ep. 106

Word become flesh? He who has ears to hear, let him hear *him* crying in the temple: 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink;' and, 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' O, if you had but a taste of the rich marrow of the grain with which the heavenly Jerusalem is satisfied, how gladly wouldst thou leave those Jewish scribes to nibble their crusts of bread." Then, he adds, "Believe one who has experience, thou wilt find more in the forests than in books. Woods and stones will teach thee what thou canst not learn from the masters."[1] It was one of Bernard's inspiring thoughts, that the right knowledge of divine things was only such a knowledge as proceeds from the interior life, from the impress of the divine upon the disposition. Planting himself upon the words, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," he says: "Knowledge makes men learned, the disposition makes them wise."[2] The sun does not *warm* all upon whom it *shines*. So wisdom does not inflame all whom she teaches *what* to do, with the *desire* to do it. It is one thing to know about many treasures; another to possess them; and it is not the knowledge, but the possession, that makes one rich. So it is one thing to know God, and another to fear him. And it is not the mere knowledge, but the fear of God, which moves the heart, makes one wise." Knowledge is to him but a preparation for true wisdom. It leads to the latter only when that which is known is taken up into the heart, and the heart is moved by it. "Yet pride," he imagines, "is very apt to proceed from mere knowledge where the fear of God does not present a counterpoise."

But it was especially the principle of a love exalted above fear and the desire of reward, which he was accustomed to regard, and to recommend to his monks, as the soul of Christian perfection. Hence preëminently above every other pious man of his times, he was called the man of love;[3] though, in a practical view, Peter of Cluny might undoubtedly claim this title in preference to all others. When he was called to Italy, in the contest for the cause of the pope, and was compelled to travel far, and undergo much fatigue, he wrote to his monks,[4] that, amid all his toils, he found the greatest consolation in reflecting that he labored and suffered in his cause, for whom all things live. "I must, whether willing or unwilling, live for him, who has acquired a property in my life, by giving up his own for me." To have their lives also consecrated solely to him, was his exhortation to his monks.[5] "To whom," he wrote, "am I more bound to live, than I am to him whose death is the cause of my living. To whom can I devote my life with greater advantage than to him who promises me the life eternal? To whom, with greater necessity, than to him who threatens the everlasting fire? But I serve him with freedom, since love brings freedom.[6] To this, dear brethren, I invite you;

[1] Experto crede, aliquid amplius invenies in silvis, quam in libris. Ligna et lapides docebunt, quod a magistris audire non possis.

[2] Instructio doctos reddit, affectio sapientes. S. xxiii, in Cantica canticor. § 14.

[3] Acta Sanctor, M. Jun. t. i, f. 826.

[4] Ep. 144, § 3.

[5] Ep. 143.

[6] Sed servio voluntarie, quia caritas libertatem donat.

serve in that love which casteth out fear, feels no toils, thinks of no merit, asks no reward, and yet carries with it a mightier constraint than all things else. No terror so spurs one on, no reward so strongly attracts, no demand of a due so pressingly urges. This love binds you inseparably with me, this love makes me ever present with you, *especially in the hours when you pray.*" Touching the essence of disinterested love, Bernard says:[1] "Not *without reward* is God loved, though he should be loved without *respect to a reward.* True love possesses enough in itself: it *has* a reward; but it is nothing other than the very object that is loved." He distinguishes, however, four stages in the progressive development of love. The lowest stage is where the man is drawn away from selfish interests, by means of self-love, to the love of God. Sufferings are ordained, to the end that man may be awakened to the consciousness of dependence on God, and, by the seeking after help in distress, be led away to God. But must not his heart be harder than iron or stone, who, after having often turned to God in distress and found help from him, does not become so softened that he must begin to love him for his own sake? Thus he attains to the second stage, where God is loved no longer merely as a helper in distress, but on account of the experience which has been had of the blessed effects of communion with himself. As those Samaritans said to the woman, who had informed them of the coming of the Lord: "Now, we believe; not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world;" so we, too, may rightly say to the flesh: "Now, we love God, not on account of thy distress, but because we ourselves have experienced and know that the Lord is gracious. Thus, by degrees, we attain to the third stage, which is to love God, not only on account of the way in which he has manifested himself to ourselves, but for his own sake; to love him, as we are loved; we, too, seeking not our own but the things of Jesus Christ, as he sought our good, or rather us, and not his own. From this is developed, finally, the fourth and highest degree of love, where self-love passes wholly up into the love of God, and the man loves even himself only for God's sake." Bernard finds this stage of love described in Ps. 73: 26: "My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever." "Blessed and holy," says he, "would I call him, to whom it is granted in this mortal life rarely, occasionally, or even but once, and that only for a moment, to experience something of this kind; for so to lose thyself thine *I*, so to renounce thyself, this is heavenly converse, and not feeling after the ordinary manner of man. As the glory of God is the end of all creation, so the point towards which all progress in religion strives, is to do all things only for God's sake. This ground-tone of the soul is, properly speaking, transformation into the image of God. But here below, man can sustain himself but for a few moments in these heights."

[1] De diligendo Deo, c. vii.

"I know not," says Bernard, "whether by any mortal this fourth attainment has been completely realized in the present life. Let them maintain that it has who have experienced it: to me it seems impossible. Without doubt, however, it is then to be realized when the good and faithful servant shall enter into the joy of his Lord."

It is everywhere apparent that the reference to Christ constituted with him the soul of the Christian life. "Thus," he says,[1] "Dry is all *nutriment* of the soul, if it be not anointed with this oil. When thou writest, nothing touches me, if I cannot read Jesus there. When thou conversest with me on religious subjects, nothing touches me, unless Jesus chimes in. But he is also the only true *remedy*. Is any one among you troubled? Let Jesus enter into his heart; and lo! at the rising light of his name, every cloud is dispersed and serenity returns. Here is a man full of despondency, running to entangle himself in the snares of death. Let him but call on the name of life, and will he not at once recover the breath of life? Where did ever hardness of heart, indolence, or ill-will abide the presence of this holy name? In whom does not the fountain of tears begin at once to flow more copiously when Jesus is named? In what man, that trembled at danger, does not the invocation of his name of power at once infuse confidence? In what man, that wavered in doubt, does not the light of certainty beam forth at the invoking his glorious name? In whom, that grew faint-hearted in misfortune, was there ever lack of fortitude, when that name whispered, I am with thee? Certainly, these are but diseases of the soul; but this is the remedy. If, for example, I name Jesus as *man*, I present to myself the meek and lowly of heart; the man radiant with all virtue and holiness; the same who is also Almighty God; who can heal me by his example, and strengthen me by his grace. Of all this, the name of Jesus at once reminds me. From the man, I take my example; from him who is mighty, my help; and of both I compound a remedy for my case such as no physician could provide for me."

But as the discrimination of the different stages of religious progress, suggested by his own rich spiritual experience, and by observation derived from watching over the souls of others, distinguished Bernard, so he went on to mark differences of degree in the love to Christ, as he had done before in the love to God. At one stage, he placed the love possessed by such as are still governed by the outward senses, — love excited by sensible impressions; at another, the love of those who are capable of rising above the appearance in the flesh to the divine in itself, and live in that. "Remark," says he,[2] "that *this* love of the heart is still, in some measure, a fleshly one, when it is moved chiefly by a regard to Christ manifest in the flesh, to what he did and commanded in the flesh. He who is full of this love is easily bowed down with contrition at the mention of Christ. When he prays, the holy image of the God-man stands before him,—born, teaching, dying, rising again, or ascending up to heaven; and whatsoever of this

[1] S. xv, in Cantica canticor. § 6

[2] S. xx, in Cantica canticor. § 6.

sort may present itself to his soul must either enkindle the soul to the love of the virtues, or expel the vices of the flesh, and quell its impulses. I think this especially to have been the reason why the invisible God was pleased to manifest himself in the flesh, and to hold intercourse with man as a man; it was, that he might first draw all the inclinations of the carnal men, who can love only carnal things, to the soul-saving love of his own flesh, and thus to elevate them by degrees to a spiritual love. At this stage, were still to be found those who said, 'Lo, we have left all and followed thee,' Luke 18: 28. Assuredly, it was love of his bodily presence alone which had induced them to leave all; and hence they could not patiently hear the announcement of his approaching sufferings which were to bring salvation. But Christ pointed them to a higher stage of love when he said, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.' To this higher stage *he* doubtless had already attained, who said, 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we *him* no more.'" Bernard marks the difference between a Christian who is easily touched by the remembrance of Christ's sufferings — and, by the blessed experience of these pious feelings, is incited to aspire after all goodness — and the Christian who, more and more purified and ennobled by such feelings, has finally attained to a steadfast zeal for righteousness and truth,— who, becoming a stranger to all vainglory, abhors calumny, knows nothing about envy, despises all human glory, avoids as it were instinctively all sin, and embraces everything good.

True humility in judging of one's self, he declared to be more than prolonged fastings, late vigils, and any bodily exercise,— the true godliness which is profitable unto all things, 1 Tim. 4: 8.[1] As it turned out with many who embraced the monastic life, that their corrupt inclinations broke out with the more force in proportion to the narrower room left for the indulgence of them,— so Bernard found it necessary to rebuke the odious practice of slandering the character of others under some hypocritical form of piety. In what he says, he discovers his profound knowledge of mankind: "First, we hear, as the premonitory sign, a deep sigh; then, with a certain dignity, with a certain hesitation, with a sorrowful look, with a lamenting tone — behold! the calumny is uttered; and the word spoken gains the more power of begetting conviction, because the hearers believe it has been uttered unwillingly, and more out of pity and sympathy than out of malice. 'It gives me great pain,' says one, 'for I love the man, sincerely, and never could cure him of this fault.' Says another, 'I knew that of him very well; yet by me it was never divulged to any one; but now it has been told by somebody else, I cannot deny its truth; with pain I say it, the fact is really so.' And he adds, 'a great pity, for in most other respects he is without a fault; but on this point, to confess the truth, he is altogether inexcusable.'"[2] "The

[1] Ep. 142.

[2] S. xxiv, in Cantica canticor, § 4. It is the same thing as was objected by Berengar, Abelard's disciple, to the Carthusians: Quid prodest, fratres exire in eremum et in eremo habere cor Aegyptium? Quid prodest, Aegypti ranas vitare et obscoenis detractionibus concrepare? Opp. Abaelard p. 326.

first thing for every man," says Bernard, "is self-knowledge; the *first*, because every man is his own neighbor; the *most profitable*, because such knowledge does not puff up, but humbles, and prepares the way for edification, — for the spiritual building cannot stand firm unless it rests on the solid foundation of humility. But nothing is better calculated to lead the soul to humility than a knowledge of itself as it is."[1] "If a soul," says he, in another place,[2] "has once learned and obtained from the Lord, the power of turning inward upon itself, of panting in its inmost depths after God's presence, of continually seeking the light of his countenance,—I know not whether such a soul would consider the suffering of hell itself, for a season, as a greater punishment than,—after having once tasted the bliss of this spiritual direction, to be turned back again to the allurements,— say rather, to the hardships, of the flesh."

As the Cistercian order gave a new impulse to strict monasticism, so it rapidly extended itself,— thus exciting the jealousy of the older monkish societies, over which it threatened to elevate itself.[3] Hard feelings grew up, especially between the old order of the Cluniacensians and the new one of the Cistercians. The Cistercians were distinguished already, by their white cowls, from the Cluniacensians, who still retained their black ones. The Cistercians stood preëminent for the severity of their asceticism,— while it was undoubtedly the case that into the Cluniacensian order there had been introduced, under the former administration, a sort of luxury which was very much disapproved of by the abbot Peter himself, and which he held it necessary to keep in check.[4] The two heads of these monkish orders, Bernard of Clairvaux and the abbot Peter, were strangers to those little jealousies of the monks, which kept them in a state of mutual hostility. The complaints of the Cluniacensian abbot William, led Bernard to compose a tract[5] on the relation in which these two orders of monks stood to each other. He laid it down, in the first place, that the unity of the church must present itself under manifold forms of life and of institutions. But, through love, everything becomes, in a sense, common to all; each appropriating all to himself that proceeds from the same spirit.[6] As to outward labors, he belonged, it is true, to but one order; but by love he felt united to all. Nay, by love, one possesses more than he does that performs the very work, if it be not done in the spirit of love. Then he severely censures the Cistercian monks, who set up themselves as judges over another man's servants; who discerned the mote in another's eye, but saw not the beam in their

[1] S. xxxvi, in Cantica canticor. § 5.

[2] L. c. S. xxxv, § 1.

[3] Thus says Ordericus Vitalis, f. 714: Novae institutionis aemulatores dispersi sunt in Aquitania, Britannia, Gasconia, et Hibernia. Mixti bonis hypocritae procedunt, candidis seu variis indumentis amicti homines illudunt et populis ingens spectaculum efficiunt. Veris Dei cultoribus schemate, non virtute, assimilari plerique gestiunt suique multitudine intuentibus fastidium ingerunt et probatos coenobitas, quantum ad fallaces hominum obtutus despicabiliores faciunt.

[4] L. vi, ep. 15.

[5] The Apologia ad Guilelmum Abbatem.

[6] The pluralis unitas and una pluralitas of the ecclesia militans.

own eyes; who, in the matter of external observances, accused others of violating the Benedictine rule, while they did not hesitate to violate that rule themselves, in regard to the more essential matters belonging to the spiritual life; for the kingdom of God is one within us; consisting, not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,— not in word but in power. Why should they concern themselves so much about the external matter of the monkish dress; why neglect the weightier matter,— the soul's interior dress, piety and humility? Those outward observances ought not by any means, indeed, to be lightly esteemed; to him they appeared to be the necessary means of training for the spiritual life. Yet the mere form, without the animating spirit just spoken of, was unmeaning.[1] Next, he censures the misgrowths of monastic life, to be found in many branches of the Cluniacensians that had degenerated into luxury; the pomp and state affected by many abbots; the splendor and excessively gorgeous art in the churches, chapels, and monasteries; the pictures, which fastened the eyes of the worshippers, calling forth the admiration of art and repressing the feelings of devotion.[2] He sees something Jewish in this, — something derogatory, therefore, to the peculiar essence of that purely spiritual worship of God which Christianity brings with it.[3] He looks upon it as a masterly device of cupidity; for by the admiration of pictures, in the loftier style of art, and in great variety, men were very easily drawn to make donations. Men flock in crowds to kiss the decorated images of saints, and they are enchained by their admiration of the beautiful, more than by reverence for the saints.[4] The bishops were obliged to let themselves down to the different degrees of culture among the men whom they had to deal with; to them, therefore, he conceded the right of employing such sensuous means, to excite the devotion of the sensuous multitude. But it was otherwise with the monks, who, dead to the sensible world, ought no longer to need such outward means of excitement, but should strive rather to reach the ideal of the purely spiritual worship of God. Thus Bernard recognizes in the rest of the church a still predominating element of Jewish sensualism; and he represents monasticism as destined to prove the chief means of emancipating the Christian life from this contamination, and of presenting Christianity in its pure spirituality. The abbot of Cluny also holds to the position, that the church cannot exist without the unity of the Spirit in the manifoldness of customs and regulations; and that love should reconcile all differences,— love, without which all mortification of the flesh is a thing of naught.[5]

Among the societies of anchorets, the order of Carthusians deserves

[1] Neque haec dico, quia haec exteriora negligenda sunt, cum potius spiritualia, quanquam meliora, nisi per ista aut vix aut nullatenus vel acquirantur vel obtineantur, sicut scriptum est, non prius quod spirituale, sed quod animale, deinde quod spirituale.

[2] Quae dum orantium in se retorquent adspectum, impediunt et affectum.

[3] Mihi quodammodo repraesentant antiquum ritum Judaeorum.

[4] Ostenditur pulcherrima forma sancti vel sanctae alicujus et eo creditur sanctior quo coloratior. Currunt homines ad osculandum, invitantur ad donandum et magis mirantur pulchra quam venerantur sacra.

[5] iv, 17. vi, 3.

particularly to be noticed. Its founder was Bruno, a pious ecclesiastic of Cologne,[1] distinguished as a scholar; afterwards, master of the cathedral school at Rheims. Over this church presided at that time one of those worldly-minded men, who valued the spiritual office only as a means of gain, and of gratifying their love of pomp and luxury. This was the archbishop Manasseh, a man whose character is aptly set forth by one of his own remarks: "The archbishopric of Rheims would be a fine thing, were it not necessary to hold mass in order to enjoy its revenues."[2] It was the impression which this profanation of holy things, and a mode of life so utterly at variance with the spiritual calling, made on the more serious minds, that induced Bruno, along with several others like-minded, to seek after a strictly ascetic life in solitude. In the wild valley of Chartreux (Cartusium), not far from Grenoble, he settled himself down, about the year 1084, with twelve companions.[3] They built a monastery, indeed, in which they held their meetings; but instead of taking up their residence in it, they lived in separate cells by the side of it, where each individual spent the whole day by himself, in silence, occupied with devotional exercises, spiritual studies, or corporeal labor. They despised all pomp and ornaments, even in what belonged to the service of the church. They refused to accept of gold or silver; only the communion-cup might be of silver. The abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, gives a remarkable example, showing how tenaciously they clung to these principles. A pious count, attracted by the fame of their strict mode of life, once paid them a visit, and earnestly exhorted them to abide faithfully by their principles. He warned them of the degeneracy which usually followed the first strict life of the monks, when the fame of their strictness had brought them into the possession of property. The impression left on him, however, by observing their singular mode of life, induced him afterwards to expose them to a temptation quite inconsistent with his own exhortations. He sent them a costly vase and cups of silver. The monks immediately sent them back, declaring that "they wanted gold and silver neither to give away, nor to decorate their church; to what use could they put it, then?" The count, upon this, sent them bales of parchment, which they needed much; for as other occupations did not comport with their quiet, solitary mode of life, they preferred to employ their leisure hours in transcribing books; and they made themselves useful by multiplying copies of the Bible, and old theological works. The greatest treasure which they possessed was their library; and the Carthusians distinguished themselves above all the other monastic orders in that they continued to maintain unaltered their strict mode of living and their contemplative habits, when their order came to be more generally respected, and their monasteries more splendidly endowed.[4]

[1] Born in the year 1040.

[2] Bonus esset Remensis archiepiscopatus, si non missas inde cantari oporteret. Guibert. Novig. de vita sua, l. i, c. xi.

[3] We follow here the credible narratives of the contemporary Guibert, without paying any regard to legends of much later origin.

[4] The (perhaps German) monk Nigellus Witeker, who, in a satirical work di-

There was another order of anchorets, who came from the East, and obtained from their original seat the name of *Carmelites*. Mount Carmel, in Palestine, had from the earliest times been an object of peculiar veneration and worship on account of its connection with the prophets Elijah and Elisha (1 Kings 18: 19 ; 2 Kings 2: 25 ; 4: 25). The cave where, according to tradition, the prophet Elijah had lived, was visited by many, and anchorets settled down upon spots in the vicinity. When, in the year 1185, the Greek monk and priest Johannes Phocas visited these regions,[1] he found there the ruins of an old and extensive monastery ; and he reports that, a short time before, an old monk and priest from Calabria, had, in consequence of a vision of the prophet Elijah, chosen this spot, erected upon it a tower and a small church, which he occupied with about ten companions. This person from Calabria is supposed to have been a certain Berthold.[2] From these small beginnings rose up the order of the Carmelites, who, near the commencement of the thirteenth century, obtained a rule from the Latin patriarch, Albert of Jerusalem. This rule transplanted to the West, would necessarily be subjected to many alterations.

The Christian love which led men to undergo every self-denying sacrifice with cheerfulness and joy, and which overcame every feeling of disgust, gave birth to many societies of monks, having it for their object to provide physical and spiritual relief for the unfortunate, and those who were cast off by all the world. Among the dreadful plagues of the Middle Ages belonged especially the sacred fire, or St. Anthony's fire,— a disorder which, after inflicting the most painful sufferings, carried off multitudes, or else left them to wear out the remainder of their days with a body rendered helpless by distortion or incurable lameness ;[3] another was leprosy. The first-mentioned fearful disorder raged especially in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[4] During the time when this plague was making its most extensive ravages, Gaston, descended from a family of consideration amongst the French nobility, in gratitude for his own recovery and that of his son, which he attributed to the mediation of St. Anthony, founded and consecrated to that saint a society, of which the express object was to

rected against the follies of all classes in his times, and entitled Brunellus, or Speculum Stultorum,— a work composed in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and which did not spare even the monks, — cannot reproach the Carthusians, as he does the others, with hypocrisy and effeminacy. Speaking of a visit which he proposed making to their order, he says : —

Cella mihi dabitur, quam solam solus habebo
Nemo mihi socius, nemo minister erit.
Solus enim psallam solusque cibaria sumam :
Et sine luce meum solus adibo thorum.
Carnis in aeternum cuneti prohibentur ab esu
Praetur eum, si quem tabida lepra tenet.
Ad fora non veniunt ; quo litem scire resolvant :
Nec populi vanum depopulantur ave,
Hospitis adventu gaudent mutantque diaetam.
Dant quod habent hilari pectore, voce, manu.

Which passage, besides being found in the complete editions of this poem, is printed also in the Extracts by Martene and Durand : Amplissima collectio, t. vi, f. 7.

[1] As he states in his report concerning the holy places, published by Leo Allatius, in the Collection of Symmicta.

[2] See the accounts collected in the Actis Sanctorum, at the 8th April.

[3] Vol. iii, p. 408, note 1.

[4] Sigebert of Gemblours, an. 1089 : Annus pestilens maxime in occidentali parte Lotharingiae, ubi multi sacro igne interiora consumente computrescentes exesis membris instar carbonum ingrescentibus aut miserabiliter moriuntur aut manibus ac pedibus putrefactis truncati miserabiliori vitae reservantur, multi nervorum contractione distorti tormentantur.

furnish nurses for persons sick with that disorder.[1] Societies were formed of laymen and ecclesiastics, who following the so-called rule of Augustin, under the direction of a superior (*magister*), spent their time in taking care of the sick in hospitals; and still other societies of men, who devoted themselves more especially to taking care of the leprous, and founded large establishments for the express purpose of receiving and nursing them. The ecclesiastics, in such societies, attended to the religious wants of patients; preached to them, gave them the benefit of their pastoral care, and the sacraments. The laymen undertook to do everything necessary for their bodily relief and comfort; also, to provide for the decent burial of the dead, according to the usual forms. The Dominican Humbert de Romanis, who lived near the close of the thirteenth century, remarks, with regard to the care of the leprous, that "owing to the danger of infection, the impatience and the ingratitude of the victims of this disease, it was one of the most forbidding labors to wait upon them. Amongst thousands, but very few were to be found who could be induced to live with them; for with many, nature itself revolts at it. And had there not been some who, for God's sake, fought down the repugnance of nature, they would have been left absolutely deprived of all human assistance.[2]" Jacob of Vitry[3] says, concerning the persons who devoted their lives to this arduous work of Christian charity: "For Christ's sake they bring themselves to endure, amidst filth and disgusting scents,—by driving themselves up to it,—such intolerable hardships, that it would seem as if no sort of penitential exercise which man imposes on himself deserved a moment to be compared with this holy martyrdom,—holy and precious in the sight of God."[4] Female societies, having the same object in view, were also formed.

But that which began in the spirit of a Christian charity that shrunk from no sacrifice, was, like so many other noble undertakings, imitated and abused in the thirteenth century by a worldly spirit that masked itself under the seemly guise of religion. Jacob of Vitry was forced to make the bitter complaint that many, who pretended to devote their lives to this nursing of the sick, only used it as a cover under which to exact, by various and deceptive tricks from the abused sympathies of Christians, large sums of money, of which but a trifling portion was expended on the objects for which it had been bestowed.[5] Pope Innocent the Second passed an ordinance against such fraudulent collectors of alms for Spitals.[6]

Among the foundations for benevolent purposes is to be reckoned the order of *Trinitarians*. John of Matha, a Parisian theologian, but a native of Provence, and Felix de Valois, after living for some time as anchorets at Certroy, in the province of Meaux, joined together and founded a society of monks, the principal object of which was to pro-

[1] See the Collections, at the 17th January, in the Actis Sanctorum.

[2] See the work of Humbertus de Romanis de eruditione praedicatorum, c. xli. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 476.

[3] See concerning him, p. 60.

[4] See Hist. occidental, p. 338.

[5] L. c. p. 339.

[6] See epp. lib. i, ep. 450

cure the redemption of Christians who had fallen captive to the infidels.[1] In the year 1198, they submitted their plan to pope Innocent the Third, who ratified it. The society subsisting under one superior (*generalis minister*) was to be consecrated to the Trinity (*Fratres domus sanctae trinitatis*), and a third part of their revenues was to be appropriated to the redemption of Christians held in bondage amongst infidels on account of their faith.[2]

Down to the thirteenth century, the different orders of monks had multiplied to such an extent that pope Innocent the Third was induced, at the Lateran council in 1215, to enact a law to the following effect: "Whereas the excessive diversity of these institutions begets confusion, no new foundations of this sort must be formed for the future; but whoever wishes to become a monk, must attach himself to some one of the already existing rules."[3] And yet it was but shortly after this time that the two monastic orders were constituted which exercised by far the most powerful and most widely diffused influence; to wit, the two mendicant orders of the Dominicans and the Franciscans. In these two foundations, especially in the latter, we may observe the renascent power of that idea of following Christ and the apostles in evangelical poverty, and the absolute renunciation of all earthly goods, which from the times of the twelfth century we saw coming up under various shapes, in the doctrine of Arnold of Brescia, in the prophecies of the abbot Joachim. It could easily come about, indeed, that from this idea a tendency might spring up hostile to the dominant church; but it might also give rise to such spiritual societies, as would devote themselves to the service of the church. For, according to the idea of the Catholic church, at its present stage, points of view and modes of life, in the greatest variety, and even opposed to one another, might subsist together, one supplying the others' defects, and the church unite all these antagonisms together in a higher unity; they would become heretical only then, when one of these tendencies came to exclude all the others, and to set up itself as the only right one. Thus, after the same manner as the married life, the family, subsisted side by side with the unmarried life as a higher stage of Christian perfection, those religious societies that renounced all worldly possessions and property, might be tolerated and favored beside the splendor of the papacy and of the hierarchy. The founder of the order of Dominicans was born in the year 1170, at Calarugna, a village in the diocese of Osma in Castile. Even while a young man, pursuing his studies at the Spanish university in Palenza, he was distinguished for his self-sacrificing Christian love. In a time of great famine, he sold his books and furniture, in order to provide himself with the means of mitigating the sufferings of the poor, and by his

[1] The accounts collected in Du Boulay, hist. univers. Paris, t. ii, f. 524.

[2] Ad redemptionem captivorum, qui sunt incarcerati pro fide Christi a paganis. Epp. Lib. i, ep. 481.

[3] In the thirteenth canon of the fourth Lateran council of the year 1215: Ne nimia religionum diversitas gravem in ecclesia Dei confusionem inducat, firmiter prohibemus, ne quis de caetero novam religionem inveniat, sed quicunque voluerit ad religionem converti, unam de approbatis assumat.

example he excited many to do the same. Didacus, bishop of Osma, was a man of severe character, and ardently devoted to the good of the church. He sought to bring back his canonical clergy to the strictness of the ancient rule, and similarity of disposition united him with Dominick, whom he received into this body. A journey which he made with him, in the service of his king to the south of France, gave both an opportunity of observing the great danger which there threatened the church from those heretical sects which were spreading with great rapidity, and they were excited by what they saw to direct all their attention and their energies to this one point. In the year 1208, they came for the second time into these regions, after pope Innocent the Third had despatched twelve Cistercian abbots, under the direction of the papal legate, to put down the sects. A council was held at Montpellier, to deliberate on this matter, and bishop Didacus was invited to assist at it. When the latter observed the great state affected by the papal legate and others who had been sent on this errand, he told them they could hardly succeed, in this way, to oppose any effectual check to the heretics. They would come off still more triumphantly in their attacks on the church, and point to all this pomp as evidence of the truth of what they had said about the worldly lives of the clergy; they would compare their own strict and abstemious mode of living, in utter poverty, as the true followers of Christ and the apostles, with the splendor and luxury that surrounded those who stood up for the interests of the dominant church, and thus gain the popular feeling over to their side. He invited them to take the opposite course, to renounce all state, and by a strict and needy life, place themselves on an equality with the persons extolled in those sects; thus would they accomplish more by their living, than they could do by their words. His advice was adopted; and everything that could be spared sent away. Bishop Didacus was intrusted with the direction of the whole movement, and, travelling on foot, in voluntary poverty, they went from place to place, preaching and disputing with the sects. After having labored in this way for three years, this bishop set out on his return to Spain. It was his intention to recommend to the pope the appointment of a certain number of men who should labor for the conversion of the sects; but his death, which took place on his journey homeward, in the year 1206 or 1207,[1] prevented him from carrying his plan into execution; and it remained for Dominick, to whom no doubt the experience which he gained in these tours had suggested the idea of his order, to realize the project which had been conceived by his bishop. The latter, on leaving the south of

[1] The death of bishop Didacus, according to the Life of Dominicus, by his disciple Jordanus, the second general of this order (the authority which we here follow), took place ten years before the Lateran council under Innocent the Third, § 30, Mens. August. t. i, f. 549. A tempore obitus episcopi Oxomensis usque ad Lateranense concilium anni fluxere ferme decem. If we take this strictly, it would be in the year 1205; but this supposition is attended with other chronological difficulties; and the *ferme* still renders the calculation inexact. It is very difficult to fix here the exact determination of time. See the chronological inquiries in the preliminary remarks to the Life of Dominicus, at the 4th August.

France, had placed him at the head of the whole spiritual undertaking. After the death of the bishop, however, he retained but few of his companions. When armed troops were called in to follow up the work of preaching and disputing, and, in the year 1209, the horrible crusade against the Albigenses was commenced, Dominick still went on with his labors, and the cruelties resorted to for the extirpation of heresy were approved and promoted by him, — a bad precedent, foretokening already the history of an order which in after times was to exercise such cruel despotism under the name of charity. He found a few still remaining here like-minded with himself, who joined with him in forming a society consecrated to the defence of the church. Several pious men in Toulouse entered heart and hand into his scheme, and placed their property in his hands, to purchase books for the society, and provide them with what they needed. Fulco himself, the bishop of Toulouse, favored the undertaking, and, in the year 1215, went in company with Dominick to Rome, for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of pope Innocent the Third, to a spiritual society devoted to the office of preaching. True, the canon enacted this very year by the Lateran council, forbidding the institution of any new order of monks,[1] stood in the way of a compliance with this demand ; but, at the same council,[2] it had also been expressed as an urgent need of the church, that the bishops should procure able men to assist them in the office of preaching, and in their pastoral labors. Now, the supply of this want — a want so sensibly felt on account of the great number of ignorant and worldly-minded clergymen — was the very purpose and aim of the scheme submitted by Dominick to the pope. Innocent, therefore, accepted the proposition, making only one condition, that Dominick should attach himself to some one of the orders of monks already existing. Dominick selected the so-called rule of Augustin, with a few modifications aiming at greater strictness. The order was to accept of no property that needed to be managed, but only the incomes from the same ; lest it might be diverted by the cares of secular business from its spiritual vocation. Pope Honorius the Third confirmed the establishment of the order in 1216 ; and it was styled, in accordance with the object to which it was especially consecrated, *Ordo prædicatorum*. In the first chapter of its articles, it was settled that it should hold neither property in funds nor income.[3] It is evident from many examples,[4] that great efforts were made to enlarge and extend the society by energetic preachers amongst its earliest members. Many young men at the universities and in other cities were carried away by the fervent appeals of the preaching friars, and finally devoted themselves to this foundation.

The founder of the second order, Francis, was born at Assisi, in the year 1182. His father, called Peter of Bernardone, was a merchant of some consideration in the above-mentioned city. Devoted to mercantile pursuits, Francis lived at first after the ordinary manner of the

[1] See above, p. 268.
[2] See above, p. 212.
[3] See c. iii. § 63.
[4] Which are cited in the Life of Dominicus, already mentioned, c. li and lv.

world; though even at this time he was remarkable for his susceptibility to religious impressions, and for his benevolent disposition. A severe fit of sickness which befell him when he was about the age of twenty-four, is said to have left on him a decided impression, which eventuated in an entirely new turn of life. It would be a matter of some importance, could we be more exactly informed with regard to the nature of his disease, and the way in which it affected his physical and mental constitution. Perhaps it might assist us to a more satisfactory explanation of the eccentric vein in his life, that singular mixture of religious enthusiasm with a fanaticism bordering on insanity; but we are here left wholly in the dark. After his health was restored, he felt more and more drawn away from earthly things, and impelled by an indescribable craving after a divine life. He thought himself admonished by Christ in dreams and visions; and in accordance with his habit at that time, of referring everything to sense, he was inclined to interpret his visions after a sensuous manner, until he was afterwards taught to understand them spiritually. On one occasion he beheld in a vision, or dream, a vast palace full of weapons, each having on it a sign of the cross; and inquiring to whom they all belonged, he was answered: "To thee and thy soldiers." Taking this literally, he was already preparing to go and offer his services to a certain noble count, with the expectation of rising to the highest honors in the profession of arms, when another vision held him back. Once, after long roaming about and meditating in the fields, he stepped into an old church falling to ruins, for the purpose of prayer. He prostrated himself in deep devotion before a crucifix, and, as he looked up to it with eyes full of tears, he thought he heard thrice coming from it the following words addressed to himself: "Go, rebuild my house, which, as thou seest, is falling to ruins." These words he understood at first as referring to the restoration of the ruined building where he was; and he set about procuring money to repair it: though long afterwards they were interpreted by himself and his followers as referring to the spiritual renovation of the church.[1] The change which he had experienced, and the extravagant austerities to which he subjected himself, caused him at first to be ridiculed as a madman; but as he could not be induced to swerve from his purpose or alter his mode of life by any ridicule or any insult, as in truth there was something in him too exalted for ridicule, and capable of attracting more profound and earnest minds, so it was certain that he must come off victorious in the end. It was an age in which the exaggerated and caricature-like, if it only had at bottom some profound idea harmonizing with the tone of many minds, would be more certain to further than to check the influence of the individual who possessed it. Like many of his times, he united with a deep mystical element, a religious tendency that clung to the outward, for which tendency this outward itself became transformed through reference to this mystical element,

[1] Bonaventura, in his Life of St. Francis, c. ii: Licet principalior intentio verbi ad eam ferretur (ecclesiam), quam Christus sanguine suo acquisivit, sicut eum Spiritus sanctus edocuit et ipse postmodum fratribus revelavit.

just spoken of, into something that savored of the magical. Thus, for example, he regarded churches with a peculiar sort of veneration, and exerted all the powers of his heart-stirring eloquence in making collections for the purpose of rebuilding such as were falling to decay. Among these churches may be noticed particularly the church dedicated to Mary, at Portiuncula. This was his favorite place of abode, where he loved to give himself up to prayer and religious contemplation, and it afterwards arose to great consequence among this order. Once, while attending mass, he heard recited the words of Christ to the apostles, when he first sent them forth: "Provide neither gold nor silver," etc., Matth. 10: 9, 10. He took it as a voice from heaven addressed to himself. This was the idea of evangelical poverty, which had already vaguely floated before his mind; and, assuming the dress described in Christ's direction, he from that moment travelled about preaching repentance, and one by one gathered around him several followers.

When Francis, in the year 1210, first presented himself before pope Innocent the Third, for the purpose of submitting to him his rule, drawn, as he thought, after the pattern of the apostolic mode of life, he is said to have met with an unfavorable reception. The pope, who was walking in his palace, plunged in thought, regarding him as unworthy of notice, motioned him away with contempt. But he was led, as it is said, by a vision which he had at night, to entertain a different opinion of the man. We know not what foundation of truth there may be for this story. Even if it were true that Innocent paid him but little notice at first, troubled as he no doubt too often was by the rude importunity of many of similar pretensions, still, the penetrating glance of this great man would not be long in discovering of itself to what valuable purpose such an enthusiasm might be turned, if taken into the service of the church, so hard pressed in these times by the sects. Such an idea — the idea of a society of spiritual paupers, placed alongside that of a church doing homage to worldly power and glory — might command respect, even from him; and he was taught by the example of the Waldenses,[1] how easily the enthusiasm for such an idea, if it did not attach itself to the church, might give birth to a tendency in opposition to the church. It admits of a question, too, whether the report is a true one, that the rule of Francis met at the beginning with much opposition from several of the cardinals, on the ground that it seemed an unheard-of thing, a project surpassing the powers of man; till another cardinal observed, If the observance of evangelical perfection is held to be a thing unheard of, impracticable, and unreasonable, such an opinion is a calumny against the gospel and the author of it, Christ himself. We may understand, at least, from the language attributed to this cardinal, in what way this age represented to itself the ideal of following after Christ.

The zealous striving after perfect purity of heart,[2] impelled Francis,

[1] Of whom we shall speak in the 4th sect.

[2] As it is expressed in the words of Francis: Tolerabilius viro spirituali fore, magnum sustinere frigus in carne, quam ardorem carnalis libidinis vel modicum sentire in mente.

impatient at every motion of sinful lust which he discerned in himself, to every sort of mortification, by which he could hope to subject the body entirely to his higher aspirations. The meditation on every such stirring of ungodly impulses, brought him perhaps into contact with various temptations; and his imagination pictured it out into a conflict with evil spirits. It is singular to observe how the power of truth in his own consciousness testified against himself. Once, when engaged at night in prayer, he thought he heard a voice saying to him: "There is not a sinner in the world whom God would not forgive, if he turned to him. But he who destroys himself by severe exercises of penance, will never find mercy."[1] This was an admonition of the Holy Spirit; just as when, once, he was thinking over with pain some of the scenes of his earlier life, the assurance of the forgiveness of all his sins was given him, and joy filled his heart, so that, resigning himself to the objective grace,[2] he is said to have desisted from further self-mortification. But now the voice of the Holy Spirit appeared to him as a voice of some wicked spirit. Yet, in the labor and constant activity which he recommended to his disciples, he recognized an important means for preventing inward temptations and likewise the waste of time in unprofitable talk.[3]

He himself, however, at a later period of life, attributed no value to self-mortification, in itself considered, but regarded it solely as a means for overcoming sensual desires, and for promoting purity of heart. Love appeared to him to be the soul of all. Once, when one of the monks, who had carried his fasting to excess, was deprived by it of his sleep, and Francis perceived it, he brought him bread with his own hands, and exhorted him to eat; and as the monk still shrunk from touching it, he set him the example, and ate first. On the next morning, when he assembled his monks, he told them what he had done, and added: "Take not the eating, but the love, my brethren, for your example." Later in life, he did not shrink from preaching before the pope and the cardinals. "His words," says Bonaventura, "penetrated, like glowing fire, to the inmost depths of the heart." Once, when he was to preach before the Roman court, for which occasion he had committed to memory a carefully written discourse, he felt all of a sudden as if he had forgotten the whole, so that he had not a word to say. But after he had openly avowed what had occurred to him, and invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, he found utterance for words full of power, which produced a wonderful effect on all present.[4] Zeal to promulgate the gospel, perhaps also a fanatical striving after martyrdom, prompted him to resolve on making a voyage to Morocco; but he was prevented from executing this purpose by sickness. Respecting his missionary efforts amongst the Saracens, we have already spoken on a former page.[5]

The spirit which, in spite of all his fanaticism, animated and inspired

[1] Bonaventura, c. v.
[2] L. c. c. iii.
[3] His words: Volo fratres meos laborare et exercitari, ne otio dediti per illicita corde aut lingua vagentur. L. c. c. v.
[4] Bonaventura, f. 294.
[5] See page 59.

this man, which enabled him to exert so profound an influence on so many minds, and to attract to him men of such importance as Bonaventura, — this spirit discovers itself to us in many of his sayings. He constantly taught, that a heart fixed on God is all that gives actions their real importance. In showing how men ought to despise the outside show of holiness, said he: "A man is just so much and no more, as he is in the sight of God."[1] "No one," he often repeated to his monks, "should value himself for that which the sinner can do as well. The sinner can fast, pray, weep, and chastise his body. But there is one thing he cannot do; he cannot be faithful to his Lord. This alone, then, is our true glory, when we give to the Lord *his* glory; when we serve him faithfully, and ascribe all to him which he bestows on us."[2] He was, in some sort, at strife with himself, as he told his monks, on the question whether he ought to devote himself to prayer alone, or also to busy himself with preaching. He thought that, as he was a simple, uneducated man, he had received a greater gift of prayer than of preaching. "By prayer," said he, "one improves himself in gifts of grace; by preaching, one communicates the heavenly gifts received to others. Prayer tends to purify the affections of the heart, and to produce a union with the true and highest good, and an increase of moral strength. But preaching leads to a dissipation of the thoughts on outward things. Finally, in prayer, we discourse with God, and hear his voice, and, as companions of the angels, live an angel-like life. In preaching, we must let ourselves down a good deal to men, live among them like men, — think, see, discourse, and hear like men. But one consideration seemed to him to outweigh all the rest, and to turn the scale; and this was, that the Son of God came down from heaven, in order to form by his example the men whom he would redeem, and to preach to them the word of salvation, reserving nothing to himself which he was not ready to give up for our salvation. And as we should copy his example in all things, so it seems more acceptable in the sight of God, that we should renounce rest, and go forth to work."[3] Accordingly, he declares the activity expended in seeking to win souls to God, more precious to him, if it proceeds from true love, than any offering. But that preacher is to be pitied, who seeks not the salvation of souls, but his own glory; or who destroys by a wicked life what he builds up by the setting forth of pure doctrine. To such a person the simple Christian is greatly to be preferred, who lacks the gift of discourse, and yet, by his own good example, promotes the cause of goodness.[4] He warned his monks against overvaluing their own powers, when they thought they saw great success attending their preaching. He spoke of those who, when they saw that some had been edified or awakened to repentance by their discourses, prided themselves upon it as their own work, when perhaps they were only instruments of others, living in secret, who had wrought these effects by their prayers.[5] "Blessed," said he, "is

[1] Quantum homo est in oculis Dei, tantum est et non plus. Bonaventura, c. vi.
[2] L. c. f. 283.
[3] Bonaventura, c. xii.
[4] L. c. c. viii, f. 286.
[5] L. c. c. xvi, f. 325.

that servant, who no more values himself on that which God speaks or works through him, than he does on that which God speaks or works through another."[1] To the vicar of his order, Elias, he wrote: "There is only one mark by which I can know whether thou art a servant of God; namely, if thou compassionately bringest back wandering brethren to God, and never ceasest to love those who grievously err."[2] He particularly recommended to his brethren itinerating through the world, not to contend; not to judge others; to be meek, peace-loving, and humble.[3] He admonished them not to despise others who lived in better style, and went better dressed. "*Our* God," said he, "is also their Master, and he is able to call them to himself and to justify them."[4] Moreover, he warned his monks against excessive asceticism. "Each should consider his own nature; and if one required a less quantity of food, another, who required more, ought not to imitate him in that; but, having regard to his own nature, he should give his body just what it needed. For, as we ought to be on our guard against a superfluity which is injurious both to soul and body, so, and still more, ought we to be cautious of excessive abstinence, since God will have mercy and not sacrifice."[5] "We are called to this," said he to his monks, "that we should heal the wounded, and reclaim the wandering; for many, who seem to you members of the devil, will still be disciples of Christ."[6] A characteristic trait in Francis, growing out of that blending of the mystical element with the sensuous, of which we have spoken, was his reverence for every outward thing that struck him as ennobled by its reference to religion; for the clergy, for churches, and especially for the consecrated bread and wine of the holy supper.[7] It was to him a matter of importance to be scrupulously careful that not a leaf on which the name of our Lord was written should be suffered to remain and be profaned in any unclean place; but that every such scrap should receive the due mark of homage. Again, as the ascetic bent admits of being easily converted into a contempt of nature, so we cannot but regard as the more remarkable that love, pushed even to enthusiasm, with which Francis embraced all nature as the creation of God; that sympathy and feeling of relationship with all nature, by virtue of its common derivation from God as Creator, which seems to bear more nearly the impress of the Hindoo than of the Christian religion; leading him to address not only the brutes, but even inanimate creatures as brothers and sisters.[8] He had a compassion for brute animals, especially such as are employed in the sacred Scriptures as symbols of Christ. This bent of fanatical sympathy with nature furnished perhaps a point of entrance for the pantheistic element which in later times found admission with a party among the Franciscans. As in

[1] Opusc. ed. Wadding t. i, c. xvii, p. 77.
[2] L. c. t. i, p. 20.
[3] L. c. t. ii, p. 172.
[4] L. c. t. iii, p. 288.
[5] L. c. p. 306.
[6] L. c. p. 341.
[7] His words in the Opusculis, p. 360: Sublimitas humilis, quod Dominus universitatis, Deus et Dei filius sic se humiliat, ut pro nostra salute sub modica panis formula se abscondat.
[8] E. g.: Mi frater ignis.

general, the culminating point of the form of Catholicism in that day exhibited itself in this order on a certain side; so from many other of the peculiar ideas which inspired Francis, as the following after Christ, evangelical poverty, — tendencies might proceed forth which were at variance with the church system. Seized and emblazoned in the colors of a sensuous fancy, that profoundly Christian idea of following after Christ gave birth to the story of the five wounds,[1] said to have been imprinted on Francis, after Christ had appeared to him in a miraculous vision, two years before his death, in 1226. Eye-witnesses are appealed to, who saw these marks at the time. A story, which assuredly did not proceed at first from any intention to deceive, — but only from the *self*-deception of a fanatical bent of the imagination, and from fanciful exaggeration; and a story with regard to which it still needs and deserves inquiry to what extent, in certain eccentric states of the system, a morbidly over-excited fancy might react on the bodily organism. It cannot be doubted, however, that this story has contributed much to promote a fanatical and excessive reverence of Francis, highly derogatory to the honor which is due to Christ alone.

Three spiritual orders were founded by him. The one already mentioned, and which was the first, avoiding each proud name, called itself the Society of Minor Brothers (*Fratres minores*, *Minorites*), and its rule, revised, was confirmed by pope Honorius the Third. The second, was an order of nuns. This started with a young woman in Assisi, — Clara, whom a kindred bent of Christian feeling, early communicated to her by education,[2] conducted to Francis; and she was the first superintendent of the order called after herself, the order of St. Clara (at first, *Ordo dominarum pauperum*). Next came the third order (*Fratres ordinis tertii*, *tertiarii*), by the founding of which, in the year 1221, Francis furnished an opportunity for pious laymen, who would not or could not renounce the family-life, to live together in a sort of spiritual union, after one rule, and under a superior. They were also called *Fratres poenitentiae*, inasmuch as this monk-like mode of life was regarded as a life devoted to penance. Many pious societies, which had proceeded from the order of laymen, might here find a place of refuge and a common bond of union.

The peculiar regulation that distinguished the orders of the so-called mendicants (*Fratres mendicantes*) from other orders, would serve in a special manner to promote their more extensive spread and more general influence. In order to their establishment in any place, no endowed monasteries were required. Every country, every village, stood open to them; and they were contented with whatever indifferent food might be offered them. The way in which they subsisted brought them into the closest relations with the lower class of people. As religious instruction and the pastoral care were for the reasons already given most neglected in their case, so the monks who interest-

[1] Quinque stigmata Christi.

[2] See the account of her life by a contemporary, at the 12th August. Her mother had distinguished herself by the zeal with which she made pilgrimages; she, in fact, undertook a journey to the holy sepulchre, and made it a point to visit all the holy places in Syria.

ed themselves with self-denying love in their spiritual wants, were received with the more hearty welcome; and, provided only pious men, well-instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, were selected for that purpose, much good might be done by their means. The men, animated by pious zeal, who first, with a sort of enthusiastic love, seized upon this mode of life, subjected themselves to sacrifices and deprivations truly great, when, in all weathers, defying the fiercest cold in the north, the fiercest heat in the south, they itinerated through the countries, entering the meanest hovels, and cheerfully putting up with any fare which the poor occupants set before them to satisfy the most pressing momentary wants, and at the same time sustained all the toil of preaching and fatigue of pastoral labors. Nor did they suffer themselves to be driven off by insults and ridicule, whether from laymen, whose utter barbarity of manners and the want of religious instruction made them regard these men as unwelcome guests, or from jealous ecclesiastics. The Belgian Dominican, Thomas de Cantinpre, who lived in the thirteenth century, relating his own experience in this way,[1] describes how he and his companions, so wearied out by a long journey which they had made on foot as to be ready to sink to the earth, arrived at a certain village. They went to the house of a parish priest; but he refused to give them even a morsel of the black bread on which he supported himself and his domestics. After they had wandered over the whole village, and applied in vain at every door, they came finally, near the end of it, to a poor hut, where they were offered a crust of bran-bread, — a very acceptable alms to persons in their condition. They sat down under the sky and regaled themselves on this fare; and never had food tasted so pleasant to them before as this bran-bread mixed with straw. "And not without deep pain," says this man, who, from being a canonical priest at Cantinpre, had turned Dominican, "did I compare myself, who was not able to undergo so much at once in a single day, with those deservedly-called blessed men who, in many places, and in much worse circumstances, are obliged to endure greater hardships than these."

With good reason, if we compare such men with other monks, might it be said of them, that although they pursued no bodily occupation to obtain a subsistence, yet they endured for other purposes far greater labors and deprivations.[2] The Benedictine Matthew of Paris, who, being an antagonist to both orders, is certainly an unexceptionable witness, relates how the Franciscans, directly after the establishment of their order, were favored by pope Innocent the Third; how they

[1] See the words of Thomas Cantipratenus, in his Bonum universale de apibus, l. ii. c. x: Numquid primo vides in praedicatorum ordine fratres, qui etsi studiis continuis et vigiliis macerati, non habentes in zona aes, per lutosa et lubrica pedibus gradientes terras praedicationibus circuire, imparata frequenter hospitia, cibos crudos, et duros, et super omnia ingratitudinem hominum sustinere? He relates in the same chapter, page 164, an example from his own experience: Veni pedes in villam ignotam mihi, longo itinere fatigatus in tantum, ut prae debilitate nimia corde me deficere mox putarem. Ingressi fratres domum presbyteri nec saltem frustum panis nigerrimi, quo familia vescebatur, potuerunt obtinere. Inde digressi late per villam nihil prorsus, nisi in fine villae a quadam paupercula fragmen panis furfurei habuerunt, donum satis magnum.

[2] See l. c.

settled themselves down in societies of ten or seven in the towns and villages; how on Sundays and festival days they came forth from their seclusion and preached in the parish churches; how they were contented with anything that was offered to them for the satisfying of their bodily wants; and how they set before all men an example of humility.[1] By their strict mode of living, their deprivations, their disinterested, indefatigable labors for the salvation of souls, these monks would gain the love and respect of their contemporaries, and so much the more as they were distinguished thereby from the other worldly and degenerate monks of older foundations, who suffered themselves to be carried away by the tide of corruption.[2] Certainly, their efficiency as preachers and pastors for the common people had a great influence and was attended with the happiest results, so long as due care was taken to select the right sort of men for the performance of these duties. It was through the powerful preaching of one of these Franciscans, Dodo of Friesland, who flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century, that a stop was finally put to the practice of taking revenge for bloodshed, which had continued to prevail in that country down to his own times.[3] Pious bishops, who were anxious for the salvation of their flocks, sent of their own accord to procure men from these two monkish orders, to take the place of the vicious and ignorant clergy, in the office of preaching and the performance of pastoral duties. But the latter, finding that their shameful deficiencies were exposed by these monks, and that the people ran after the new preachers and confessors, became their bitterest enemies. Robert Grosshead, bishop of Lincoln, for example, a prelate sincerely anxious for the spiritual prosperity of his extensive diocese, was inclined to encourage in every way the labors of the mendicant friars among his people. He was obliged to complain that his clergy[4] resorted to various bad arts, for the purpose of drawing away the people from the new preachers and confessors belonging to the two mendicant orders; whilst others, whose influence was most injurious to piety, but whose spiritual quackery brought gain to their employers, were welcomed into the field.[5] He bade the priests of his diocese take every pains to

[1] At the year 1207: Sub his diebus praedicatores, qui appellati sunt minores, favente papa Innocentio, subito emergentes terram repleverunt, habitantes in urbibus et civitatibus deni et septeni, nihil omnino possidentes, in victu et vestitu paupertatem nimiam praeferentes, nudis pedibus incedentes, maximum humilitatis exemplum omnibus praebuerunt. Diebus autem dominicis et festivis, de suis habitaculis exeuntes, praedicaverunt in ecclesiis parochialibus evangelium verbi, edentes et bibentes quae apud illos erant, quibus officium praedicationis impendebant. Qui in rerum coelestium contemplatione tanto perspicaciores sunt inventi, quanto a rebus praesentis saeculi et carnalibus deliciis comprobantur alieni.

[2] Complaints of the licentious manners and rude worldly lives of many among the Benedictines, may be found in a letter of Robert of Lincoln, in the collection already cited on page 185, ep. 53, p. 343, and ep. 108, p. 382.

[3] Thomas Cantipraten. t. i, c. i, p. 120.

[4] On whom first he had to make requisitions of this sort, ut sciat unusquisque saltem simpliciter articulos fidei et decem mandata. See his address to his clergy, l. c. p. 260.

[5] Sunt quidam rectores et vicarii et sacerdotes, qui non solum audire fastidiunt praedicationes utriusque ordinis, sed sicut possunt, ne audiat eos populus praedicantes aut iis confitentur, malitiose praepediunt, admittunt etiam, ut dicitur, praedicatores quaestuarios ad praedicandum, qui solum talia praedicant, qualia nummum melius

persuade the people to attend diligently on the preaching of the monks and to confess to them, but to have nothing more to do with those quacks, — those quaestuarii, or penny-preachers, as the same class of people were called in the sermons of the pious Franciscan, Berthold, in the last times of the thirteenth century.[1] He requested the general of the Dominicans to send him an assistant[2] from his order;[3] since he stood in great need of help, his diocese being larger and more populous than any other in England. It was his desire that the archbishop of Canterbury might have men around him that were not only versed in the civil and canon laws, but that had also studied divine wisdom in the sacred oracles, and received it not merely into their minds, but also into their hearts, and bore testimony of it by their daily walk; but such men were to be found only in the two orders.[4] So agreeable to his views were the renunciation of everything earthly, and the zeal for the salvation of souls in those two orders, so much did he hope from them as a means of good to the church, that he is said to have seriously entertained the idea of entering into one of the orders himself. At a synod held at Cologne, under the papal legate, Conrad, a parish priest complained of the encroachments of the Dominicans, who, under the character of confessors, had contrived to win the favor of the people, and to monopolize everything to themselves. The legate upon this, asked him how large his congregation was; and being told that it consisted of nine thousand souls, he severely rebuked the man who was willing to undertake alone the responsibility of caring for so many souls, and did not rather rejoice to find men, who were willing to assist him gratuitously in his formidable work.[5]

But the greater the influence exercised by the mendicant friars, as preachers and confessors, and as persons who mixed familiarly with

extrahunt. See ep. 107 to his archdeacon.

[1] In the letter just referred to. Among the treasures of the cathedral library of Prague, a rich and important collection for everything pertaining to church history, are to be found many other manuscript letters of the bishop of Lincoln, serving to illustrate this point, which are not contained in the collection published by Brown. In a letter to the pope, in which he laments over the corruption of the church and the great want of religious instruction, he mentions the Dominicans as shining conspicuously above all others throughout the whole land, luce praedicationis. Ep. 6. In a letter to the cardinal de Ostia (ep. 7), he says: Fratres Minoritae per Angliam constituti sua salubri praedicatione populum efficaciter illuminant ad veritatem. In a letter to a bishop, in which he advocates the cause of the injured mendicant friars, he says of them: Verbo praedicationis et exemplo populum illuminant et supplent in hac parte defectum praelatorum. During a short residence in Prague, in the year 1817, when, by the distinguished kindness and liberality of a very worthy man, whom I hold in grateful remembrance, the late archdeacon Pallas, I was allowed the privilege of consulting these treasures with the utmost freedom, I took these notes. May the example of that excellent person, in allowing men of letters the freest access to those valuable treasures, shine forth as a light to all that come after him.

[2] See above, p. 207.

[3] Ideo nos pluri et efficaciore indigemus auxilio in verbi Dei praedicatione, confessionum auditione, poenitentiarum injunctione, prudentiori quoque consilio in variorum et novorum casuum quotidie emergentium secundum scripturarum intelligentiam sana et salubri determinatione nec novimus tam efficacem in hac parte coadjutorem quam fratrem, etc. Ep. 40, p. 334.

[4] See ep. 114, p. 388, and Matthew of Paris, at the year 1247, f. 630.

[5] See Thomas Cantipraten. l. i, c. ix, p 39.

all classes, upon the people,—so much the more pernicious would it prove when it came to be abused by ignorant and badly disposed men; and of such there would be no want as the branches of these orders extended and multiplied. The causes that had introduced corruption amongst the other monkish societies, as soon as they attained to eminence, were not inactive in the case of these; and soon, many evils began to intermingle with the benefits which flowed from them. As they enjoyed the special favor of the popes, and, through their respective generals in Rome, stood in close relations with the popes,—they allowed themselves to be employed by the latter as instruments for exacting money, and for other bad purposes. The historian Matthew of Paris, who had himself perceived and extolled the good influences of these foundations at the time of their first appearance, complains of the change which had taken place in the same monks after the lapse of a few years; how they erected sumptuous buildings, and though it was against their wishes, yet consented to be employed by the popes for exacting contributions.[1] If we may credit him, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, who had hoped so much good from them, denounced them shortly before his death, because his expectations had in so many respects been disappointed.[2] Men had occasion to complain of the obtrusiveness of these monks, of the tricks to which they resorted in order to slip into monasteries, and there fix themselves, after they had once been voluntarily received as guests. It was said that they sought to elevate themselves at the expense of all other monks and ecclesiastics; that they took pains to represent their order as the only holy one; that they bound the people exclusively to themselves; and endeavored to instil into them distrust of their clergy, who, to be sure, often furnished occasion enough for it. Easily might the people be carried so far as to regard all other confessors — and among the clergy there were but too many whose lives were altogether scandalous — as worthless, and to run after these monks alone.[3] The enormous influence of these orders threatened to overturn the whole previous constitution of the church, and to do away the various gradations and intermediate links between the pope and the other parts of which the church was composed.[4]

Partly by the force of the idea lying at the bottom of these two orders, and having its deeper ground in the pious spirit of the age,—partly by the authority which individual preachers exercised over the minds of men, the minds of the youth were especially carried away. Young men of every rank entered, sometimes,— as in the case of the far-famed Thomas Aquinas, contrary to the will of their parents, into one of these orders. Such as had been brought up in a luxurious

[1] Papa de ipsis, licet invitis, suos fecit telonarios et multiformes pecuniarum exactores. At the year 1250, f. 696; comp. the year 1234, f. 339.

[2] See Matthew of Paris, year 1253, f. 752.

[3] See Matthew of Paris, year 1236, f. 354.

[4] Words of Matthew of Paris, year 1246, f. 608: Multi praecipue nobiles et nobilium uxores, spretis propriis sacerdotibus et praelatis, ipsis praedicatoribus confitebantur, unde non mediocriter viluit ordinariorum dignitas et conditio et de tanto sui contemptu non sine magna confusione doluerunt nec sine evidenti causa, videbant ordinem ecclesiae jam enormiter perturbari. Comp. the documents of evidence furnished by Dr. Gieseler in the Studien und Kritiken, i, 1, an. 1828, S. 109, and onward

manner, were, by enthusiasm for the church and for the salvation of souls, rendered capable of enduring the greatest hardships.[1] This influence on the youth threatened to spread still more widely; even at the universities it seemed to be constantly on the increase. One of the main directions of spirit in the thirteenth century — the scientific speculative spirit, penetrated and imbued with religious feeling — was powerfully influenced by the idea of these two orders. Men of great acuteness and profundity, — destined to be the teachers of their times and of succeeding centuries, proceeded from these orders. By their means, too, a ready entrance was procured for them into the universities; and it was to be feared that they would become masters of all the influence in these establishments, — that these great institutions would have to lose their freedom and independence. To be sure, the defenders of these orders could appeal to the fact, that the teachers whom they sent out had attained to such eminence by their superior diligence and zeal, — since they were never drawn aside from their work by worldly amusements, — while the professors from the order of the secular clergy, were wont to indulge in various dissipations, and bestowed much less care on their lectures.[2]

Moreover, these monks contrived, by fair means or foul, to establish their authority in the families of noblemen and princes, as confessors and pastoral laborers.[3] Possessing so much influence with the popes — who often chose their secretaries from these orders — and with the potentates of the world, — whom men from the same order frequently served as counsellors and agents, — they were regarded by the other monks and by the clergy with fear, and men took care how they got into quarrel with them.[4] King Louis the Ninth of France, — whose piety, though it had a monk-like taint, yet was something more than bare superstition and ceremonial observance, — a piety truly penetrated by vital Christianity, by the spirit of Christian love, — promoted, from religious motives, with peculiar zeal, the interest of these two orders of monks. Wherever he heard of zealous preachers, he sent for them to come to him. While residing at Yeres in Provence,

[1] Thomas Cantiprat. l. ii, c. x, p. 171: Vidimus maxime in initio ordinis praedicatorum, vidimus et nunc juvenes inexpertos, delicatos, recenter a saeculo venientes, circuire terras socialiter combinatos inter nocentes innocentes, simplices sicut columbas inter astutissime malignantes, prudenter tamen sicut serpentes in sui custodia ambulantes.

[2] Thomas Cantipratenus who, we admit, wrote in the interest of his party, but still, could hardly be supposed to manufacture what he said out of whole cloth, reports, l. ii, c. x, p. 281: Videbant scholares, quod magistri saeculares sicut viri divitiarum dormierunt somnum suum, ducebantque in bonis dies suos, et quum vespere multiplicitate ferculorum obruerentur et potuum et postea vigilare non possent, nec studere; et per hoc nihil invenire in manibus, quod proferrent, sequenti mane solennem diem constituebant, auditoribus condensis, et sic per ineptas vacationes, quibus sua clerici expendere se dolebant, optato privabantur studio.

[3] Bishop Robert of Lincoln is said before his death to have objected to them that, independent of all worldly considerations as they had become, by their renunciation of the world, and therefore in a condition to rebuke wickedness in the mighty ones of the earth, they yet neglected to do so. See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1253, f. 752.

[4] Matthew of Paris, year 1236, f. 354: In multis cedebant iis religiosi, propter potentum offendiculum. Erant enim magnatum consiliatores et nuncii, etiam domini papae secretarii, nimis in hoc gratiam sibi saecularum comparantes.

he invited to his court a preacher of this class, the Franciscan Hugo, who was creating a great sensation in those parts.[1] He must also preach before the king; he did so; and told the king that, if he wanted to enjoy a long life and happy reign, he must practise justice; by the contrary course, empires had sunk to ruin, among believers and unbelievers. The king invited him repeatedly to stay with him, as long as he remained in Provence; but the pious monk did not wish to be interrupted in his labors amongst the people; he excused himself, and spent only a day at the court.[2]

The two orders of monks, countenanced and supported by such mighty powers, met with the most violent opposition from the university of Paris, which vindicated against them its ancient freedom. This university formed a society distinguished by its independent spirit, a society which boldly maintained its rights in the contest with popes and monarchs. When she believed these were encroached upon, her teachers were accustomed to suspend their lectures and sermons and shut themselves up in retirement, which, by reason of the great influence this university exercised on the scientific culture of the times, — when the youth resorted to it from all quarters of the world,— made no small impression. This means of defence was also employed by it during the present contests. It seemed at first that the cause of the two orders must succumb; for pope Innocent the Fourth, moved by the complaints that came to him from all sides of the progress of the mendicants at the expense of the old ecclesiastical order; of the infringements on the rights of bishops and parish priests and the interruption of their labors,— issued a bull, in the year 1254, designed to protect the latter in their rights, and to set limits to the all-absorbing influence of the mendicant friars. He thereby drew upon himself the hatred of the latter, — who interpreted his death,[3] which followed shortly afterwards, as a divine punishment,—and who felt strong because they could rely upon the help of more than one monarch.[4] So much the

[1] The following words of his last will, addressed to his son, characterize the man: "The first thing I recommend and prescribe to thee is, that thou shouldst love God with all thy heart, and above all things; for without this no man can be blessed. And take good heed that thou doest nothing which may be displeasing to God; that is, that thou committest no sin; for sooner oughtest thou to be willing to suffer any torture, than to allow thyself to be hurried into any mortal sin. If God sendest upon thee misfortune, accept it cheerfully, and thank him for it; consider that thou hast well deserved it, and that everything shall work together to thee for good. If he bestows on thee prosperity, thank him with all humility, and take care that thou dost not from pride, or in any other way, become the worse for it."

[2] This is stated by Joinville, in the Mémoires, ed. Petitot, t. ii, p. 384.

[3] Thomas Cantipratenus characteristically remarks: Eadem die paralysi percussus obmutuit nec unquam postea invaluit aut surrexit. Qui etiam a quodam sanctissimo viro extra muros orbis Romae manifestissime visus est mortuus dari sanctis Dei Francisco atque Dominico judicandus. L. c. l. ii, c. x, § 21, p. 174. Compare the altogether different manner in which the free-spirited English Benedictine, Matthew of Paris, judged concerning the death of this pope. See page 187.

[4] Thomas Cantipratenus says: "The princes, when they heard of a hostile bull which was about to be fulminated by this pope against these two orders, swore that they would seize the possessions and revenues of the secular clergy. if the pope meant to destroy the two orders: 'for,' said they, 'these orders have been given as a special blessing to the world, by virtue of the instruction they communicate and

more favorable to the mendicant friars was Innocent's successor, Alexander the Fourth, who issued several bulls, deciding in their favor against the Parisian university,— where they continually sought to extend their influence and to monopolize more places. The rights of this university were at that time defended by a man of great firmness and resolution, possessed of a strongly-marked individuality of character, and a clear understanding,— the Parisian Canonicus and Doctor of Theology, William of St. Amour (Guilelmus de Sancto Amore).[1] In direct opposition to the mystico-speculative tendency, represented by the more important theologians of the two orders of monks, clearness of understanding constituted with him the predominant quality. In a writing composed A. D. 1255, "*De periculis novissimorum temporum*," he described those monks, without naming them, as the precursors of antichrist, as mock-saints and hypocrites, who, by various wicked arts, sought to bring all influence in the church under their own control. What is said in the gospels concerning the pharisees, and in the pastoral epistles concerning the false teachers of the last times, he applies to them. The same points he set forth in his preaching; and courageously defended, in conversation and in letters, what he had asserted in that book.

The entire mode of life followed by these monks he represented as one opposed to the spirit and essence of Christianity. He brought against them the precept given by the apostle Paul in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, that every man should support himself by the labor of his own hands. He who would gain his livelihood by begging, is beguiled thereby into flattering, calumniating, and lying. When the mendicant friars maintained that, in following Christ, they strove to reach the highest perfection, he replied: "It is a work of perfection, for *Christ's sake*, to leave all and follow him, in the sense of imitating him in good works. Christ invited men, Luke 18: 22 (the passage usually quoted in support of the *consilium evangelicum* of poverty), to follow him in doing that which is good, not by begging, for this is a thing forbidden by the apostle Paul. He who has renounced all earthly goods in order to strive after perfection, must either support himself by the labor of his own hands or seek his maintenance in a monastery. Christ and his apostles never begged; Christ carried about a purse with him; he and his apostles had women with them, who provided for their bodily wants. The apostles gained their subsistence by working at their trades, and received freewill offerings only from those to whom they preached the gospel." He does not hesitate to declare, that although this mode of life, which was really at variance with the gospel, had been erroneously confirmed by the church, yet this judgment of the church should be revoked after the truth became known, for even the judgment of

the example they furnish to it," c. x, p. 174. The zealous defender, and the fiercest opponent of the two monastic orders agree together, when William de St. Amour says of the mendicants: Principes illis favorabiliores provocant contra illos, qui eos non recipiunt aut quos odiunt.

[1] So called from his native city, then belonging to Burgundy.

the Romish church was liable to correction.[1] He appeals to the authority of the Lateran council of 1215, and to its interdict against the multiplication of monkish orders, quoted on a former page.[2] "Yet why, after the promulgation of this law, have so many new foundations of this kind sprung up, unless — which far be it from us to say — this council erred in enacting such a law?"[3] He not obscurely charges those monks with pharisaical arrogance, when they appropriated the name *religio*, a name which it was customary in the thirteenth century to give to monasticism, to their mode of life;[4] and he applies to them the saying of Christ (Matthew 23 : 15), with regard to the proselyting spirit of the pharisees; objecting to them, that persons, who before had lived in simplicity, if they were persuaded to embrace their so-called religion, turned at once into arrant hypocrites. Among the artifices by which they sought to increase their influence, he reckons those in particular by which they endeavored to draw over to their side young men of fine parts at the universities.[5] As they exercised so great an influence by their preaching, he attacked them also on that score, accusing them of having obtruded themselves uninvited into the calling of preachers and pastors; of seeking only to make a display of their eloquence, their penetration, and their learning, but caring little about that which might minister to salvation.[6] He objected to them, that, after having procured canonization for men belonging to their order, they resorted to all possible means of glorifying their festivals, extolled their miracles above those of the ancient martyrs and of the apostles, and even boasted of spurious miracles;[7] that they contrived, by auricular confession, to make themselves acquainted with all the particular and personal relations of individuals, and then availed themselves of this knowledge to sway the minds of men, and to draw them off from their ecclesiastical superiors.[8]

It deserves to be noticed that he hints at the possibility of a schism of the church, to be brought about by their means. If once the prelates should perceive it to be necessary to resist their encroachments and their overgrown authority, they might easily be tempted to go to the length of renouncing obedience to them; and the consequence would be, that men would also renounce obedience to the Roman see, and the unity of the church being thus broken up, the way would be prepared for the coming of antichrist.[9] It is worthy of notice again, that he foretells how, as opponents of the secularization of the clergy, as defenders of humility in the appearance of the church, they would incite the monarchs to deprive the church of all her secular possessions, on the ground that nothing but a purely spiritual jurisdiction belonged

[1] Cap. xii.

[2] See above, p. 268.

[3] Page 391.

[4] *Secta* sua, quam religionem appellant, c. xiv.

[5] Plerumque circumeunt universitates, in quibus juvenes ingeniosi et subtiles valeant inveniri, quibus inventis circumeunt illos verbis compositis, commendantes suum statum et suas traditiones, p. 319.

[6] Non ea quaerentes quae ad salutem suam et aliorum proficiant, sed ex quibus singulariter eruditi apparent, p. 395.

[7] Page 413.

[8] Cujuslibet proprietates per confessiones rimando et sic populum multipliciter sibi alliciendo et a suorum praelatorum et doctorum veracium doctrina et consiliis avertendo, p. 208.

[9] Page 209.

to her.[1] He spoke against a certain pietistic bent, promoted by the influence of these monks, which led men to look upon a coarse and squalid dress as a mark of humility. He maintained, on the contrary, that one might wear even sumptuous apparel, were it but appropriate to the station of the individual and to the customs of the land, and not subservient to pride;[2] and that pride may go in the dress of a beggar as well as in costly robes. Pride in a beggarly garb was so much the worse, because it carried hypocrisy along with it, which he proved by quoting Matthew 6: 16.[3] Nor did he hesitate to attack the direction which had been given by the influence of the mendicant friars to the piety of king Louis the Ninth. He said, among other things, in one of his sermons, that it behooved kings[4] to clothe themselves in a manner corresponding to their exalted station, since this was requisite in order to maintain their royal dignity. It was not required of them that they should hear many masses every day,[5] or that they should attend early mass; but that they should dispense justice, and faithfully fulfil their calling. To put down the party of the Papellardi,[6] (a term equivalent to canters, pietists, in later times,) among whom Louis the Ninth was reckoned by worldly-minded people and the opponents of monkish piety,[7] he employed the following singular argument: "Were it a sin to wear, under befitting circumstances, a costly garment, Christ would not have worn that seamless coat (John 19: 23), which, in relation to his poverty,

[1] Sub eo etiam praetextu, quod sint humilitatis ecclesiae zelatores laudant et justificant principes saeculares, temporalem ecclesiae jurisdictionem coarctantes, dicentes scilicet ac persuadentes dictis principibus, quod ecclesiae non debet habere jurisdictionem temporalem, ut sic ad eos facilius recursum habeant in suis negotiis, p. 419.

[2] He was charged with asserting, Quod pretiositas vestium non nocet vel juvat ad saeculum. But he declared that he had expressed himself as follows: Quod licet uti veste pretiosa, dum tamen non excedat homo vel mulier modulum personae suae vel mores provinciae, vel non hoc faciat causa movendae concupiscentiae.

[3] Page 92.

[4] King Louis the Ninth declared himself opposed to superfluity of ornament in dress; and said that the money expended in this way had better be given to the poor. See his life by Gottfried of Beaulieu, in Du Chesne, script. hist. France, t. v, f. 447. It was his wish to wear on Friday and several other days, for penance, a hair shirt (*cilicium*), next his body; but his own confessor told him that such penance was not befitting a person in his station; he ought rather to be bountiful in bestowing alms, and to be strict in administering justice to his subjects. L. c. f. 451. Yet Joinville, in his Memoirs, cites a principle set forth by this monarch: Que l'on se doit vestir en telle manière et porter selon son estat, que les prudes du monde ne puissent dire: vous en faites trop, n'aussi les jeunes gens: vous en faites peu. Ed. Petitot, p. 175.

[5] King Louis heard daily two, frequently three or four, masses. To the nobles, who murmured at this, he said, "If he only would spend the same amount of time in throwing dice, or in hunting in the forest, nobody would have a word to object." See Gottfried de Beaulieu, l. c. f. 456. William de St. Amour is doubtless referred to in what Thomas Cantipratenus says (see page 277), in his Bonum Universale, l. ii, c. lvii, § 64, p. 588: Erubescebat theologicae cathedrae vilis ille praesumptor, qui praedicavit, ipsum, de quo scripsimus regem, non debere communibus uti vestibus sed semper purpuratum incedere, nec plures missas audire, quam unam. Mortaliter autem peccare dicebat omnes illos, qui dictum regem inducerent ad hujusmodi devotionis et humilitatis exemplum.

[6] The name denotes, etymologically, a person wholly devoted to the popes, the parsons, the clergy. The Papellardi were, in the thirteeth century, most directly opposed to the people of the world, Mundanis.

[7] Rex papellardus. Vid. Thomas Cantipraten, l. c. § 63. It is related that the Dominicans almost persuaded the king to consent to be admitted into their order; vid. Richerii Chronicon Senonense, l. iv, c xxxvii. D'Achery Spicileg, t. ii, f 645.

must have been costly enough."[1] Accordingly, he warned men against that false humility which is assumed for appearance sake; and is said to have remarked, in one of his sermons,[2] "Were one now to put on so costly a garment, the Papellardi would spit at him, as the pharisees spat in the face of our Lord Jesus Christ, when so clad." And since the idea which lay at bottom of the orders of the mendicant friars, was an idea widely prevailing; since there were, indeed, a number of societies of laymen, men and women, who had associated for the purpose of engaging in a similar mode of life; and since it was the custom to call the persons thus associated, praying brethren (*beghardi*) and praying sisters (*begninae*, *beguttae*), William of St. Amour could say, in defence of himself, that "the mendicant friars had no right to regard his strictures on the pietistic bent that belonged amongst the dangers of the last times, as an attack upon their particular mode of life,—which had been approved by the apostolic see; for in truth all his remarks applied to those pious associations which rested upon no such high authority, but had been attacked from various quarters. He referred particularly to those young men and maidens itinerating about in France, who, under pretence of living only for prayer,[3] had really no other object in view than to get rid of work, and live on the alms of the pious.[4] As he had attacked none of those orders by name, which subsisted by authority of the Roman church, so, whoever felt himself hit by what he had remarked in a very general way, about uncalled preachers, canters, beggars, and vagabonds, would find that he was accused by nobody but himself."[5]

The cause of these monastic orders was defended with spirit and ingenuity by distinguished men of their own body; such as Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas; but yet, not without a due share of that sophistry of party feeling, which may be discerned on both sides. Their statements do, on the one hand, really expose the injustice and extravagance of many things said by their antagonists; but on the other, they are obliged to testify, in spite of themselves, to truth which bore unfavorably on their own interests.

With the greatest justice the defenders of the mendicant friars could affirm that the bad state of the clergy rendered such kind of assistance as that which was furnished to the church by their orders, a matter of necessity. Bonaventura maintained, that "because sins within the church were continually on the increase, and the bishops, occupied with external things, could not turn their attention to spiritual affairs; because few shepherds resided with their churches, but the ma-

[1] Page 97.

[2] Yet it is not affirmed that he expressed himself in precisely these words.

[3] Like those more ancient Euchites.

[4] Propter quosdam juvenes, quos appellant bonos valetos et propter quasdam mulieres juvenes, quas appellant beguinas per totum regnum jam diffusas, qui omnes, cum sint validi ad operandum, parum certe aut nihil volent operari, sed vivere volunt de eleemosynis in otio corporali sub praetextu orandi, cum nullius sint religionis per sedem apostolicam approbatae, p. 91.

[5] Si qui ergo praedicatores contra se specialiter dicta ex more suspicentur, et asserant et ideo ea ferre non possint, sed contra illa quasi ad suam defensionem se praeparent et eorum praedicatores impugnent, videntur esse tales, quales supra dictum est, p. 440.

jority committed the guidance of souls to hireling vicars, who were for the most part ignorant, negligent, and impure in their lives,—therefore the pope, on whom devolves the care of the whole church, has called us to the assistance of the clergy and the communities."[1] How very necessary it was that preaching and pastoral duties should be intrusted to others besides the parish priests, Thomas Aquinas proves, by referring to the incompetency of many priests, who in a large number of districts were so ignorant as not even to understand the Latin language. "Very few, indeed," he said, "had made themselves acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, though a preacher of the divine word should be well instructed in them." Again, many communities were so large that a single parish priest, who did nothing else in his whole life, would find it impossible to hear carefully the confessions of all. Experience teaches, too, that if they had none to confess to but their own parish priests, many would wholly omit it; either from an unwillingness to confess their sins to those with whom they daily associated, or because they looked upon them as their enemies, or for various other reasons. They whose business it was to care for the salvation of souls, should be distinguished for their knowledge and their holy lives; and a sufficient number of men of this sort could not be found to provide for the wants of the parish priests throughout the entire world; since, indeed, it was on account of the want of well-informed men, that the ordinance of the Lateran council, of the year 1215, that, in all the metropolitan churches, men should be appointed capable of teaching theology could not be carried into effect by the secular clergy. But by these monks the want was supplied to a much greater extent than had been required by that council; so that, in the words of Isaiah, the land was full of the knowledge of the Lord. Experience plainly showed how much had been accomplished by these orders, founded for the support of the priests who could not satisfy all demands. In many countries heresy had by their means been extirpated; many infidels reclaimed to the faith; many persons in various parts of the world instructed in the law of God; very many awakened to repentance; so that if any one ventured to pronounce such establishments unprofitable, it could be clearly made out against him that he envied them on account of the grace which wrought through them, and made himself guilty of sinning against the Holy Ghost.[2]

It might now be argued again in defence of these orders, that if they were designed for the purposes above described, then it became necessary for the members to pursue those studies which were requisite to qualify them for their office; that, in order to get this education, and fit themselves for discharging the duties of this vocation, they must not be required to support themselves by the labor of their own hands. This, Bonaventura sets forth as follows: "No one amongst us," says he, "is allowed to be idle, but the sick. Some busy themselves with study, in order to qualify themselves for the business of

[1] See Determinationes circa regulam, S. Francisci, opp. t. vii, ed. Lugd. f. 330

[2] Contra impugnantes religionem opusc xvi, ed Venet, t. xix, page 341, et seqq.

instructing the faithful; others, with the performance of divine worship; others, with the collecting of alms for the support of the community; others bestow their services, with which they are specially charged, on the sick and the healthy; those who have learned trades, work at them for the benefit of the brethren and of strangers; others, who are so directed, itinerate in different countries, — since we have nobody else to employ on such missions."[1] The defenders of these orders concede to William of St. Amour, that many of the bad things censured by him were really to be found in individuals amongst them; but they complain of the injustice he had done them in accusing the whole for what was the fault only of a few.[2] "That which is bad," says Bonaventura, "swims on the surface, and is easily noticed by every one. True holiness is a hidden thing, and is to be found out only by certain marks."[3] Thomas Aquinas objects to their opponents, that they took it upon them to judge over the conscience, over the hidden things of the heart, when they accused the monks of seeking after the favor of the world; after their own glory, and not the glory of Christ; and of many such-like things. It was only presumption or envy to judge thus. It was the common resort of such as were disposed to decry and to censure rather than to correct.[4]

Yet it cannot be denied that these distinguished men betrayed the too strong bias of a predilection for their order, when they labored so much to extenuate grievous faults, of which the members of their order were clearly convicted; arguing that no man in this world can live without sin, 1 John 1: 8.[5] If the monks were eager to be received by the rich; if they intermeddled with matters which did not concern them, in order to secure for themselves a comfortable maintenance; if they sought temporal gain among those for whom they preached, — these were to be regarded as slight failings, for which they ought not to be called sinners, much less false apostles.[6] Bonaventura,[7] in defending these orders against the reproach that they fawned on the rich, says: "We ought, certainly, to love all, in the Lord; to long after the salvation of the poor as well as of the rich, and seek to promote it to the utmost of our ability, and in the way most profitable for both. Therefore, if a poor man is better than a rich man, we should love him more; but we must honor the rich man most, notwithstanding; and this for four reasons: First, because in this world God has placed the rich and mighty above the poor in respect to their

[1] L. c. f. 333.

[2] Ut videlicet, quod ab uno vel duobus geritur, toti religioni imponere praesumant, sicut cum dicunt, quod non sunt cibis sibi appositis contenti, lautiora quaerentes, et multa hujusmodi, quae etiam si ab aliquibus aliquando fiant, nullatenus sunt totali collegio imponenda. Thomas Aquinas, opusc. xvi, p. 410.

[3] L. c. f. 336.

[4] Quod maxime faciunt, qui magis amant clamare et vituperare, quam corrigere et emendare. Opusc. xvi, p. 411.

[5] When Thomas Aquinas brings it as a charge against his opponents, that they peccata levia, quae etiam in quibuscunque perfectis inveniuntur, quasi gravia exaggerant, he reckons among them, quod quaerant opulentiora hospitia, in quibus melius procurentur, quod procurent aliena negotia, ut sic mereantur hospitia, quod rapiant bona temporalia illorum, quibus praedicant et alia.

[6] Quae etsi in vitium sonent, non tamen sunt tam gravia, ut pro eis dici possint peccatores, qui haec committunt, nedum ut pro iis possint dici pseudapostoli.

[7] L. c. f. 338.

worldly circumstances; so that, in honoring the rich, we concur with the divine order: Secondly, on account of the weakness of the rich, who would be angry and sin if we refused to pay them such honor. — they would oppress us, and other poor people: Thirdly, because more good results from the conversion of a rich man than from that of many poor men, —for the converted rich man edifies many by his example; and through him, much good may be done and much evil prevented."[1] Justifications of this character serve, perhaps, rather to confirm than to refute many of the objections brought by the Parisian theologian against these two orders.

The unflinching advocate of the university of Paris, who had long defended its rights against the most distinguished men of the mendicant orders, before the court of Rome, William of St. Amour, finally had to succumb to the united spiritual and secular powers, which acted under the influence of these monks. His book, "De periculis novissimorum temporum," which on account of the many remarks it contained, cautiously and forbearingly, indeed, yet freely expressed, against the arbitrary proceedings of the popes, could not make a very favorable impression at the Roman court, was condemned in the year 1255, by pope Alexander the Fourth. He had to resign his post, and was banished from France.[2] He retired to Burgundy, his native country. With the successor of pope Alexander, Clement the Fourth, he found means of becoming reconciled. He placed in the hands of the latter a revised copy of the work which lay at the foundation of his treatise "On the Dangers of the Last Times;" and consisted of a collection of proof-texts from Scripture, relating to this subject. He lived beyond the year 1270.[3] Although these contests died away, yet the same spirit of freedom was maintained in the university of Paris, which had offered so determined an opposition to the mendicant friars.

The effect of these fierce assaults on the mendicant orders of monks would be to direct the attention of the well-disposed in them to the points in which they had degenerated, and to call forth efforts for reform. Although the pious Bonaventura, when he had to defend his order against its antagonists, was too inclined to play the part of an advocate, in palliating many of the abuses, yet he expressed himself in an altogether different manner when he addressed the superiors of the order themselves. He now exhibits himself as the rigid censor; and by his own strictures shows that there was foundation for many of the above-stated charges. When, in the year 1256, he was appointed general of his order, he issued a circular letter[4] to the presiding officers of the same in the several provinces, calling upon them in the most urgent manner to do their utmost to remove the abuses which had crept in. "The danger of the times," he writes to them, "the

[1] L. c. f. 338.

[2] In a poem belonging to these times, the so-called Roman de la Rose, it is said of him: —

Estre bany de ce royaume,
A tort comme fut Maitre Guilleaume,
De St. Amour, qu' hypocrisie
Fit exiler par grand' ennuie.

[3] Du Boulay, hist. univers. Paris, t. iii, f. 686.

[4] Epistola ad ministros provinciales et custodes, opp. t. vii, ed. Lugdunens. f. 433

violation of our own consciences; the scandal of worldly people, to whom the order, which should be to them a mirror of holiness, has become an object of contempt and abhorrence; all urge us to action." He declares to them, that he had examined into the causes by which the splendor of the order had become dimmed, and had found that it was to be traced to the fault of some of its own members. He then proceeds to enumerate several particulars, which had brought the order into bad repute. Cupidity, than which nothing could more directly be opposed to the poverty for which the order had been founded; costly and sumptuous buildings; the monopolizing of funerals and of the drawing up of wills,[1] a thing which could not fail to create great dissatisfaction amongst the clergy, and particularly the priests. To this list, he added the enormous expense occasioned by the itinerant brethren. "For, as they cannot be satisfied with a little," says he, "and as the love of men has waxen cold, we have all become burdensome, and we shall come to be still more so, if some remedy be not soon applied. Though there are very many, whom such accusations do not touch, still, the disgrace will come upon all, if the innocent have not courage enough to resist the guilty. So let the ardor of your zeal burn forth; and after you have purified the house of our Father in heaven from those who make it a house of merchandise, let it kindle in all the brethren the fire of prayer and devotion." He recommends it to them especially, in accordance with the rule of Francis, to proceed more cautiously in admitting members into the order, and to limit the number of those to be received. They should allow no man to become a preacher or confessor without a previous rigid examination.[2] After the same manner, he expresses himself in a special letter to one of the provincial superiors. "In former times, the observance of the evangelical perfection made us universally respected and beloved; but, at present, when the multitude give themselves up to their bad passions, and superiors cease to enforce the necessary strictness, it seems that many vices are stealing among us which make this venerable society burdensome and contemptible to the people." He expresses great dissatisfaction with those who, contrary to the rule of Francis, assault the clergy in their sermons before the laity, and only sow scandal, strife, and hatred; with those who injure the pastors by monopolizing to themselves the burial of the dead and the drawing up of wills, and who had thereby made the whole order detested by the clergy.[3] "It is an abominable falsehood," he declares, "for a man to profess the voluntary adoption of the most extreme poverty, while he is unwilling

[1] See on this point, the treatise of Gieseler, referred to on page 280. The superstitious considered it a great privilege to be buried among the monks, in some one of their churchyards, a circumstance which the latter knew how to turn to their own advantage. The Benedictine Richer says, in the Chronicle of the Dominicans, already noticed: Illos, qui eis talia dona conferebant, quod Papa facere non potest, a peccatis rapinarum et usurarum absolvebant et mortuos in coemeteriis suis solenniter sepelierbant. Chronicon Senonense, l. iv, c. xvi, l. c. f. 634.

[2] Officia praedicationis et confessionis cum multo examine imponatis.

[3] Sepulturarum ac testamentorum litigiosa et avida quaedam invasio cum exclusione illorum, ad quos animarum cura spectare dinoscitur, non modicum nos clero toti fecit exosos.

to suffer want in anything; for a man to be rich inside of the monastery, while outside of it he begs like a pauper. All the brethren should be directed to be careful and avoid every occasion of giving just cause of complaint to the clergy. It should appear manifest to the whole world, that they were not seeking their own advantage, but simply the winning of souls to Christ.

But even before the death of Francis, there was formed within the order the germ of an inward schism leading to important consequences; the strife between a party who were zealous for the literal observance of the so-called evangelical poverty, and another, who retained only the appearance of it, but in the splendor of monasteries and churches, as well as in other respects, allowed themselves to depart, in manifold ways, from that original principle. The brother Elias, a disciple of Francis himself, who occasioned great disturbances in the order, stood at the head of this laxer party. In opposition to him stood forth other important men, and in particular the influential Anthony of Padua. Sometimes general of the order, Elias fell and rose by turns, till finally he was cast aside entirely and turned out of it. But the quarrel between the two parties in the order still went on. The question was, how to unite any possession whatsoever, necessary for this life, with evangelical poverty. Men resorted to a distinction, by which greater latitude of interpretation could be given to this term. They distinguished between a *right* of property, and the *simple use* of another's property for the satisfaction of the necessary wants of life. As property, the Franciscans should possess nothing; but the *right* of property in all goods administered by them should be given to the pope.[1] Thus arose the two parties of the more strict (*Zelantes*, *Spiritales*) and the more mild Franciscans. The popes, by their explanations of the Franciscan rule, especially Nicholas the Third, by his bull issued in 1297, (called, from its commencing words, *Exiit*, *qui seminat*,") favored the principles of the milder party, and expressly confirmed the distinction above stated. So the fanatical zeal of the Zelantes was fanned into a conflict with the dominant church itself. Add to this, that as the writings of abbot Joachim had found great acceptance with this order generally, which believed that itself had been predicted in them, so the more zealous party in particular busied themselves a good deal with those writings, — and the more, in proportion as they became dissatisfied with the existing state of things, and as their fanatical enthusiasm was excited by opposition. The idea of an ultimate perfection of religious life, of the last times of the kingdom of God, of the age of the Holy Ghost, of the everlasting gospel, was pushed by them to still further extremes; and their extravagant notion of the perfection of a life without property, consecrated

[1] See Bonaventura in the Determinationes quaestionum circa regulam Francisci Qu. xxiv: Praesul sedis apostolicae, qui est generalis omnium pauperum ecclesiae provisor, specialiter nostri ordinis curam habet, omnium mobilium, quae ordini conferuntur, proprietatem sibi assumsit, exceptis his, quorum dominium sibi conferentes retinuerunt et nobis usum earundem rerum solum concedit, ut semper alieno victu et vestitu ac tecto et aliis utensilibus absque proprietatis jure, ex ipsius concessione utamur.

to contemplation alone, would lead them into the mistake of regarding the whole appearance and evolution of Christianity, thus far, as only a subordinate thing in comparison with that highest stage of spiritual perfection, for which they were to prepare the way. A spiritual pride of mysticism would be ready to exalt itself above everything positive and objective in religion; and we have already pointed out, on a former page, the point of support which such a tendency might find, in several expressions of the abbot Joachim. Many fanatical tendencies, which appropriated to themselves these ideas, were diffused by the different kinds of Beghards, who found refuge in the third order within the general order of Francis.

But here we stop, — intending to reserve the more detailed exhibition of the remarkable facts, which are here merely hinted at, for the Fourth Section of the present history.

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

To the epochs that mark the commencement of a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit, may be reckoned the opening of the twelfth century; and the after effects of the religious awakening which then began among the Christian nations of the West, extend far into the period now before us. As we observed in individual examples, under the preceding section, the religious life was continually receiving a fresh impulse from influences of various kinds: from the vigorous measures of Gregory the Seventh to promote a reform in the whole church; from the impressions produced on the multitude by the preaching of the crusades; from the effects wrought by distinguished preachers of the clerical, and more especially of the monastic order, who itinerated through the countries, exhorting men to repentance; from the founding of the two orders of mendicant friars. Great susceptibility to religious impressions, as well as great depth and power of religious feeling, manifested themselves by various signs of the times: by the quick and general participation in important enterprises undertaken in the name of religion; by the formation of societies in which the energies of many could be speedily united for accomplishing great works consecrated to religion, such as the erection of magnificent churches;[1] by the mighty influence which men who could exert an influence on the religious life, soon acquired; by the rapid spread of religious societies, whether connected with the church, or with the sects that were opposed to it.

Over against religion stood the rude power of unsubdued sensuousness, of fierce and eager passions, that announced themselves by rude outbreaks of crime, and either with brutal obstinacy maintained their ground, or finally yielded to the mightier force of religious impressions. "How many do we see every day," says the pious mystic, Richard a St. Victore,[2] "who, amid the crimes which they are constantly committing, never abandon the hope and purpose of repentance; and who not only mean to leave off sinning, but to renounce every worldly posses-

[1] The zeal with which men of all ranks and ages could unite together in building a church, is illustrated by an example belonging to the year 1156, which may be found in the life of the abbot Stephen of Obaize. l. ii, c. xviii: Aderat hujus tantae aedificationis initiis inaestimabilis hominum multitudo diversi generis atque aetatis cum multo coetu nobilium, quorum alii potentiores auxilium et protectionem, divites pecuniam offerebant, pauperes, quod rebus non poterant, votis supplebant protensis in coelum manibus. The foundation-stone was laid with great solemnity, a circumstance to which the author attributes special importance, because this represented the foundation-stone on which the entire church reposes, and other than which can no man lay. See Baluz. Miscellan. t. iv, p. 130.

[2] De eruditione interioris hominis, l. ii, c. xxv.

sion, and join themselves to some order of monks. And so, if God, in his sovereign mercy, have compassion on them, they become reformed. But others, when exhorted to repentance, swear they never could prevail upon themselves to give up the world, or abandon their lusts."[1]

Sudden transitions from the most violent outbreaks of sensual rudeness to emotions, no less violently expressed, of a more or less enduring contrition were of no rare occurrence. The awe-inspiring appearance and words of pious monks had a power, especially when strengthened by the impression of some remarkable incident, to produce great changes in minds whose religious susceptibilities had, as yet, been only kept back by the force of barbarism; as we have already seen illustrated[2] in the remarkable effect produced by the monk Bernard of Tiron, on a crew of barbarian pirates.

Active benevolence, hospitality; sympathy with the sick and suffering; kindness and respect shown to pious ecclesiastics and monks, devout participation in prayer and in all the ordinances considered as belonging to the church life; zeal in the Christian education of children; rigid abstinence; such were the signs under which genuine piety exhibited itself even among the laity. A biographical sketch belonging to the twelfth century presents us with a picture of the piety of these times in the account of a married couple, who are held up as patterns. They owned and resided on an estate in the diocese of Vienne. They supported themselves by honest labor, lived with great frugality, gave liberally to the poor, and sympathized with them in their sufferings. They were full of respect and love to pious monks; and took great pains in bringing up their children to faith and good works. To neither of their sons, whom they destined for the spiritual profession, would they allow a benefice to be given in advance. After they had done educating their children, they practised a rigid abstinence, living like anchorets in the midst of the world, and devoting themselves with still more zeal than ever to the work of almsgiving. Sleeping themselves on straw, they gave up the better beds for the use of the poor; and while the whole of their house was ever open to the needy and the wayfaring, they set apart one chamber, expressly for their use. As to the monks, they were not only ready to receive them, but took pains to fetch them in. They drew instruction from them about the way of salvation, not merely for their own benefit, but that they might be able to impart it to others. They exerted themselves to restore peace between parties at strife; to aid the injured, and to bring those who wronged others to a sense of their injustice.[3] In the beginning of the twelfth century, we find a person in Brittany, by the name of Goisfred, who, in his younger days, had lived by

[1] His words: Quam multos quotidie videmus, qui inter flagitia, quae assidue committunt, spem et propositum resipiscendi non amittunt et non solum peccata dimittere, imo etiam omnia quae mundi sunt, relinquere et ad ordinem et religionem venire proponunt. Alii autem, cum de conversione admonentur, nunquam se ad ordinem vel religionem venire etiam cum juramento affirmant et cum de peccatis corripiuntur se a suis voluptatibus non posse exhibere cum sacramento asseverant.

[2] See above, p. 236.

[3] Vita Petri Archiep. Tarantas: see above p. 239. Acta Sanct. Mens. Maj. t. ii, c. i. f. 324 et 325.

robbery, but, by the admonitions of his pious wife, had been led to change the whole course of his life. He now lived by the labor of his own hands, and, reserving from his earnings barely enough to support himself and his family, distributed the rest in alms. During a violent snow-storm in mid-winter, he drove to a monastery with great difficulty a wagon laden with bread for the celebration of some saint-day.[1] In a biographical account of certain pious country-people, in the twelfth century, the following points are cited as characteristic marks of the Christian life: both husband and wife showed by the best evidence,—the fruits of their good works,—that they were true Christians; for they were zealous in bestowing alms, in giving food to the hungry, in clothing the naked, and in performing other pious deeds of charity.[2] Of the mother of archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg, it is related, that she was almost constantly engaged in almsgiving, prayer, and fasting; and that she seldom ate anything but vegetables. She caused a church to be erected on her estate, and conveyed the stones for it two miles barefoot on her own shoulders; many other women followed her example.[3] — It is recorded of a pious smith, in this century, that he daily lodged poor people in his own house, first washing their feet, and then providing beds for them.[4] — The father of a family, whenever he went to church, took provisions with him for the poor people who lived in the neighborhood.[5] Ambrose of Siena, a much-venerated Dominican, who lived near the close of the thirteenth century, was descended from a respectable and wealthy family in that city. He was, while a youth and still living under the paternal roof, particularly distinguished for a spirit of active benevolence.

So it is said in the account of his life.[6] The law of Christ is founded for the most part in love; this grace, therefore, predominated in him. He obtained leave from his wealthy father to take home with him every Saturday five strangers, to entertain them and present to each of them a certain sum of money. On every Saturday evening, he placed himself near that gate of Siena which was the thoroughfare of those strangers who came from beyond the Alps. Choosing five from the whole, and conducting them to his own house, he showed them to a room set apart expressly for their service. He himself provided them with everything necessary to supply their bodily wants, till he had waited upon them to their beds. The next morning he accompanied them to mass, and then led them round to the principal churches of the city. Returning with them to his house, he gave them a breakfast, bestowed on them an alms besides, and dismissed them, after recommending himself to their prayers. But he took a special interest in the condition of those who languished in confinement. He was accustomed, on every Friday, to visit the public prisons. And, if he found any poor people there who were unable to provide for their own support, he took care to send them privately, one day in the

[1] Orderic. Vital. Hist. l. vi, f. 628.
[2] Acta S. Mens. Januar. t. ii, f. 795.
[3] L. c. Mens. Jun. t. iv.
[4] L. c. Mens. Jun. t. v, f. 115.
[5] See life of the abbot Stephen of Obaize, l. i, c. iv.
[6] Acta S. Mens. Mart. t. iii, c. ii, f. 183.

week, a certain allowance of food and money. Every Sunday, he visited the hospital of the city at meal time, and assisted those who took care of the sick in distributing among the patients their allotted portions of food. He strove also to comfort them. He entered the houses of the poor; and, if he found any sick and wanting the necessaries of life, he begged of his parents that their wants might be relieved, and was himself the bearer of the charities bestowed on them. He declined all invitations to social parties and weddings. And already was he beginning to show symptoms not only of an inclination to withdraw from the world, but of a tendency to the monastic life, when, like St. Francis,[1] he experienced a remarkable reaction of the freer Christian spirit. It so happened, that he was invited to attend a wedding-feast at the house of a relative. He declined the invitation, and in the mean time turned his steps to a Cistercian monastery, beyond the walls of the city. While on the way, he was accosted by an old man, in the Dominican habit, who begged of him an alms, taking occasion at the same time of entering into conversation with him. He said: "Thou thinkest of gaining merit in the sight of God, and of better providing for thy soul's salvation, by shunning the society of thy relatives and associates, and declining to take any part in the celebration of a holy marriage. But I tell thee, thou wilt obtain more favor and merit in the sight of God, if thou disdainest not to mingle in the society of thy associates; for it is far more praiseworthy in his sight to battle with the temptations and dangers of the soul, than to lead the secure life which thou proposest to do. Wilt thou not fall into the sin of pride, or give others occasion to accuse thee of it, if thou disdainest the society of those who would honor thee? And how wilt thou secure thy soul's salvation, if without the marriage estate, which God has ordained, thou art unable to conquer the temptations of the flesh? It is the free gift of God which bestows on some the ability of leading a chaste life apart from marriage. But it is pride which leads thee to imagine thyself able to do this out of thy self-will, and by thine own efforts." The appearance of this free-minded sage was transformed by the people of those times into an appearance of Satan — disguised as a monk, for the purpose of deceiving the young man.

We read of an English nobleman, near the close of the eleventh century, who finding himself shut up for a year in close confinement, on account of some political charge, gave himself wholly to exercises of penitence and devotion. The effects of the change which he underwent manifested themselves in the resignation and composure with which he met the death to which he was condemned. He walked to the scaffold clad in the costly robes which belonged to his rank and office; but on arriving there distributed them among the poor that stood around as spectators. Falling upon his knees, he prayed for some time, weeping. When the executioner, who had been ordered to hasten the execution of the sentence, urged him to stand up, he said:

[1] See above, p. 271.

" Suffer me, in God's name, to repeat one more pater-noster for myself and for you ;" and, again kneeling, he prayed with hands and eyes uplifted to heaven. But when he came to the words, " Lead us not into temptation," the tide of his inward feelings gushed forth in a flood of tears, and choked all further utterance.[1]

An example of sincere and active piety from the class of common artisans, is presented in the case of a certain Raymund Palmaris, at Placenza. Born in that city, in the year 1140, and descended from a pious family of the middle class, at twelve years of age he was apprenticed to an artisan; the occupation, however, did not suit a mind striving after higher things. Having lost his father while young, and being no longer obliged to follow the trade for which the father had destined him, he was seized with an earnest desire to quicken and nourish his devotion by a visit to the sacred spots in Palestine. Having made up his mind, he informed his pious mother of it, and she resolved to undertake the pilgrimage with him. After they had with great devotion visited all the spots consecrated to the memory of our Saviour, they returned home to their country. Raymund, soon afterwards, lost his mother, upon which he married, and resumed his former occupation. He had five sons ; each of whom, when they received baptism, he was accustomed to dedicate to God with the following prayer : " Here is a being who wears thine image ; to thee I dedicate him, as thy creature ; life and death are in thy hands." The five children were all, one after another, removed from him in early life. He resigned himself to the will of God, and it was a comfort and joy to him, that the Lord had called them, in the robes of innocence, out of this life of temptation, to himself. He looked upon it as an admonition, warning him thenceforth to live with his wife as if they were unmarried ; which he proposed to her, having too conscientious a regard for duty to carry this plan into effect, without the consent of his companion. Another son was born to him, and in the absence of his wife he took the child from its cradle, carried it to the church, threw himself down with it before a crucifix and prayed: " My Lord and Saviour, who stretchest out thine arms to receive all who come to thee, as thou hast taken to thyself my five children, in their tender age, and made them fellow-heirs of eternal bliss, I beseech thee vouchsafe to receive also to thyself this my little son, whom thou hast bestowed on me, beyond all my hopes. But, if thou hast destined him for a longer life, preserve him chaste and pure for the holy order of monks, to which I now consecrate him." Even at this time, while he was still an artisan, and had the care of a family, he improved every hour which he could spare from the business of his trade, and also the holidays, to obtain from pious and well-informed ecclesiastics and monks a more exact knowledge of the contents of the sacred Scriptures, and of the doctrines of religion. The knowledge thus acquired, he intended to use in promoting the salvation of his fellow-men. On Sundays and festivals, he collected together in a workshop the people of his own

[1] Orderic. Vital. f 536.

class, and particularly such as followed the same trade with himself, and whom he could persuade to forego their customary amusements, at those times, and addressed them on matters of practical Christianity. These addresses met with so much favor, that multitudes soon flocked together from all quarters to hear him. Many invited him to preach in the public streets, and on the market-place. But this he refused, saying that it belonged to none but priests and the learned to do this; an uneducated man like himself might by this course easily fall into mistakes. He contented himself with simple practical exhortations, designed for his fellow-craftsmen: these considered him as their spiritual father, and lived as a pious community under his guidance. After the death of his wife, he resolved to carry out a purpose which he had long had in contemplation, and wholly withdraw himself from all secular business. He committed his little son to the care of his maternal grandparents, that he might be trained up to the profession of a pious monk. He surrendered into their hands all his property, to be managed and used for the benefit of this son. He now prepared to go on a pilgrimage to all the holy places, intending finally to settle down in the vicinity of the holy sepulchre, and there end his days. He had already completed the pilgrimage to St. Jago di Compostella in Spain, and other holy places, and had at length repaired to Rome, and was on the point of setting out for Jerusalem, but by the spirit of Christ he was taught a better course. The voice of that spirit, in the inmost recesses of a heart so warm with true piety, would doubtless often be heard remonstrating against the mistaken tendency into which the undue influence of religious feeling alone, in the absence of better knowledge, had hurried him. Such reaction of the genuine Christian spirit gave birth to a dream which befell him in one of the porches of St. Peter's church, where he once happened to lay himself down to sleep in his pilgrim-garb. Christ appeared to him, and told him that he was by no means pleased with his plan of making a pilgrimage to the holy sepulchre. "Thou oughtest," the voice seemed to say, "to employ thyself on things more acceptable to me and more profitable to thyself, on works of mercy. Believe not that, in the last day, I shall inquire particularly concerning pilgrimages and such pious acts, when I shall say, 'I was hungry, and ye gave me food,' etc., (Matt. 25.) Thou oughtest no longer to roam about thus in the world; but go back to thy native town, Placenza, where there are so many poor, so many forsaken widows; so many sick, who implore my compassion, and none to receive them. Go thither, and I will be with thee, and give thee grace by which thou shalt be enabled to stir up the rich to benevolent action, to restore the contentious to peace, the wandering to the good way." In obedience to this admonition he returned, in 1178, to Placenza; and the bishop to whom he made the matter known, felt bound to recognize it as a divine call. He was furnished with a house for the purpose he had in view by the canonical priests of the collegiate church. He sought out all the diffident poor, and such as were prevented by sickness from begging, collected alms for them, and took care of them. All who were helpless found

welcome admittance and relief from him. His example operated upon others; many of the citizens associated themselves with him, to share, under his direction, the task of supporting and nursing the poor and the sick. He appropriated a separate dwelling for the sick and poor of the female sex; here also he received such as he succeeded in calling from a life of unchastity to repentance, and the direction of them he intrusted to pious, well-tried women. After they had lived sometime in this manner he left them free to choose the mode of life which would be most agreeable to them. If they preferred to marry, he endeavored to assist them in this matter, and to procure for them a dowry from his pious friends. Those who showed an inclination for the monastic life, he contrived to get admitted into monasteries. He diligently visited the prisons, distributed temporal relief among the prisoners, and by his exhortations and admonitions endeavored to promote the salvation of their souls. In behalf of such as seemed to him to give proof of sincere penitence, he interceded with the magistrates, and became security for them that they would pursue a different course of life and prove useful to the state. Many of these, in order to escape temptations, withdrew to the monastic life and distinguished themselves afterwards by the piety and integrity of their lives. He sought after outcast children, gently took them up in his arms, carried them home, and saw that they were taken care of. Oftentimes, he would take on his shoulders some sick person, whom he found lying in the street, and convey him home to the above-mentioned dwelling. Widows and orphans, and all who suffered wrong treatment, found in him a protector. Bearing his cross before him, and relying on him whom it symbolized, he feared nothing; to that love which led Christ to give up his life for the salvation of mankind, he appealed, to exorcise passion. Thus he reconciled those who were at variance; thus he sought to hush the strifes of fiercely contending factions amid the civil broils of Italy. When the citizens of Placenza and of Cremona were at war with each other, he threw himself between the two armies and succeeded in persuading his countrymen to peace. But the people of Cremona, indignant because he threatened them with divine judgments, hurried him away as a prisoner. Yet the spirit of love still continued to inspire him, and wrought so strongly on their feelings, that they soon let him go, repenting of their having so treated one whom they felt constrained to reverence as a saint. After having labored in this manner for twenty-two years, he cheerfully looked forward to death. Commending to his associates the prosecution of his work, and exhorting them to take care of the poor whom he left behind, he thanked the Saviour that he had brought his earthly career to the long-desired goal; he sent for his only remaining son, warned him against loving the empty goods of this world and yielding to its temptations, advised him to confirm the dedication that had been made of him when a child, and take refuge in the monastic life. He testified that he put no trust in his own merits, but confided solely in the mercy of Christ; looking serenely on the cross, which had ever accompanied him in his consecrated labors, he said, "In thy arms, in

thy name and thy strength, I depart from this world to my Saviour and Creator." These were his last words.[1]

This particular shaping of the Christian life presents itself to us in a multitude of examples among all ranks of society. From the Christian artisan, let us now turn to the Christian prince. In king Louis the Ninth, of France, we see the piety of these times represented to us in all its noble traits intermingled with those one-sided extravagancies which called forth the covert censure of the free-spirited William of St. Amour.[2] On him, too, the training of a pious mother (Blanche), had exerted a decided influence, as he informs us himself. She surrounded him with pious monks; and on Sundays and festivals had him always attend the sermon. Having once heard it falsely reported of her son that he lived an unchaste life, she exhibited the utmost concern, and remarked that if her son, whom she loved more than any other creature, had fallen sick with a fatal disease, and she was assured that he might be restored by a single act of unchastity, she would prefer that he should die, rather than offend his Creator by a mortal sin. This remark left a deep impression on the mind of Louis, and he often repeated it, in expressing his abhorrence of that sin. "There was no leprosy so hateful," he was accustomed to say, "as a mortal sin is to the soul." He once remarked at his table, that "the devil took a very cunning course in seducing usurers and robbers, and then moving them to give what they had got by usury and robbery, for God's sake, to the church; when they knew to *whom* they must give it back at last." So, with reference to a similar case, he warned his son-in-law, Thibault the Second, to take care lest he might bring his soul into jeopardy, if he supposed he could atone for all his sins by the bountiful alms which he bestowed on a Dominican monastery. Being threatened with shipwreck near the island of Cyprus, when on the voyage to make his crusade in the Holy Land, he sprang from his bed, and threw himself before a crucifix; and when the danger was over, he remarked, that "this threatening display of God's Almighty power ought to be regarded as an admonition calling upon them to make haste to purify themselves from all evil and engage earnestly in every good work." Mindful of the temptations that constantly beset men, he considered steadfastness of faith as the greatest of all goods; and he exhorted all to strive after it in due season, that they might be well armed in the final hour, when Satan would seek to awaken in them all manner of doubts. "We should aim to possess it in such measure as to be able to say to him, 'Away hence, thou enemy of human nature; thou shalt not prevail to draw me off from that which I firmly believe.' Gladly would I suffer every limb to be severed from my body if I can only die in this faith." When he was taken prisoner by the Turks, and to obtain his liberty and save his life was required to promise something on his oath, which he believed he

[1] The source of this narrative is a Life, in the Latin language, which certainly proceeded from a contemporary. We have it to regret, however, that this was lost, and only the Italian translation preserved, which was retranslated into Latin. It is to be found at the 28th July. Mens. Jul. t. vi.

[2] See ante, page 285.

would never be able to accomplish, he peremptorily refused, saying, if he should not fulfil what he had promised, he would be like a Christian that denied his God, the law of his God, and his baptism. He would rather die like a Christian, than live under God's anger. When he was informed of the death of his beloved mother, falling on his knees before the altar in his court-chapel, he said: "My God, I thank thee that thou didst send my dearest mother to me, so long as it pleased thy goodness, and that thou hast now, after thine own good pleasure, taken her to thyself. It is true that I loved her as she deserved to be loved, — more than every other creature. But since it has so pleased thee, let thy name be eternally praised!" He set a high value on good sermons, and was in the habit of repeating them over with delight to others. Being detained ten weeks at sea on his return from the East, he caused three sermons weekly to be preached on board his ship. When the sea was calm and the mariners had little to do, considering how few opportunities they enjoyed of hearing the word of God, he ordered that a sermon should be preached expressly for them, on some subject appropriate to their condition, on the articles of faith, or the practical life of a Christian.

Reminding them of the dangers to which their lives were constantly exposed, he exhorted them to confess to priests of their own choice; and if, while they were confessing, a rope was to be pulled, or anything else needed to be done on board the ship, that required their help, he chose rather to lend a hand himself than suffer them to be interrupted when attending to the concerns of their salvation. By this means many were induced to confess, who had not done so for years. Being informed that a Turkish Sultan had taken pains to collect, and to have transcribed books, of every kind that could be procured, for the use of the learned, he remarked that the children of darkness were wiser in their generation than the children of the light; and on his return to France he directed copies of the Church fathers, from all the monasteries, to be transcribed for himself and others. He preferred to have them copied rather than to purchase them, in order that the copies might be multiplied. He habitually refrained from every form of the profane language which was everywhere so prevalent in those times. To avoid every sort of protestation, he was in the habit of substituting, in lieu of every other, the phrase, "In my own name." But on hearing that this practice was censured by some monk, he ever afterwards contented himself with a simple yea or nay. As, in the last years of his life, he avoided all expensive raiment,[1] thus occasioning a loss to the poor, on whom the garments he left off were usually bestowed as presents, he felt himself bound to make up the deficiency by adding to the sum which he yearly appropriated for alms. To the last days of his life he busied himself with the thought of a mission to Tunis. He died praying, with his eyes directed to heaven.

In addition to what we have cited on a former page,[2] from the last

[1] Of which William of St. Amour takes notice. See ante, page 285

[2] Page 282.

testament of Louis to his son, we may mention the following particulars as characteristic of the man: "I admonish thee to confess often, and to choose for thy confessors discreet and honest men, able to teach thee what thou hast to shun and what to do. And demean thyself so modestly towards thy confessors that they may venture kindly and boldly to reprove thee. Conduct thyself so uprightly towards thy subjects, as ever to maintain the straight-forward course, deviating neither to the right hand nor to the left, inclining rather to the side of the poor than of the rich, till thou art fully certain of the truth. But when one has a complaint against thyself, adopt thine adversary's side till thou hast ascertained the truth; thus will thy counsellors more readily declare themselves on the side of justice." The testament closes with these words: "In conclusion, I bestow on thee every blessing that a loving father can bestow on his son. May the whole Trinity and all the saints preserve thee from everything evil; and may God give thee grace so to do his will, that by thee he may be honored; that so, after this life, we may together behold, love, and praise him without end."[1]

From the female sex we may cite, in the same century, the landgravine Elizabeth of Hessia, St. Elizabeth, who, after the death of her husband, retired wholly from the world. In the absence of the latter, she led a strictly ascetic life. But whenever she heard of his speedy return, she performed what to her must have been a still greater piece of self-denial, attiring herself in all her princely array; which she did, as she said, only from love to Christ, that her husband might not conceive a dislike to her and be tempted to sin, but ever retain towards her true conjugal love, in the Lord."[2]

The Christian life generally moved betwixt the two extremes of an excessive devotion to, and an undue estrangement from, the world. The first-mentioned tendency we find to have been that of the great mass, who supposed that, by a number of outward religious acts, in which they formally participated; by the repetition of certain prayers; by going to church; by making donations to churches and monasteries; by almsgiving, they satisfied every demand of Christianity, — while, at the same time, they abandoned themselves to their pleasures, till, impressed by some preacher of repentance, or surprised by some sudden calamity, they were led to perceive the vanity of their dead faith and of their mere outward Christianity, and excited to strive after the true essence of piety. In opposition to this worldly Christianity rose up, next, a much smaller number, with whom piety was really a matter of earnest and sincere concern; who were deeply imbued with the peculiar Christian spirit, but who, by reason of this opposition, were forced into an ascetic monk-like direction. Thus, there proceeded from the very midst of the laity, pious societies, formed for the purpose of a spiritual, contemplative life, or for pious objects

[1] The sources, we have cited on page 285. All may be found collected in the Actis Sanctorum, fifth volume, month of August, under the 25th of the month.

[2] See her life, by the Dominican Theoderic of Thuringia, lib. ii, c. v, Canisii, lect. antiq. ed. Basnage, t. iv, f. 124.

of a more practical character; the members of which commonly passed under the name of Beghards; a freer imitation of monasticism. We recognize in them that strong inclination to social union, quickened by religion, which distinguished the twelfth century, — the mighty energy of that idea of evangelical poverty which set itself in opposition to the secularization of the church. Among the quite diversified shapings which maintained a connection with, or stood out in opposition to, the church, we notice such pious societies as the one formed by Vicelin,[1] and those founded by Raymund Palmaris, by the Apostolicals, the Waldenses, — at their first commencement, — of which we shall speak on a future page. When the minds of men were excited by the contests between Henry the Fourth and Gregory the Seventh, in Germany, such pious societies began to be formed also among the country people; by men and women, married and unmarried; who committed themselves to the guidance of ecclesiastics or monks.[2]

Now when such names were once invented to designate that tendency of piety opposed to the world, — just as the term "Pietists" came to be employed in later times, — *Beghardi*, *Papellardi*,[3] *Boni homines*, *Boni valeti*,[4] it came about that these names, used in different senses to denote different sets of religious opinions, were laid hold of by men of a more liberal Christian spirit — like the abovementioned William of St. Amour — as a sort of nickname for some caricature of piety, — though such caricatures were certainly in these days extremely rare, — as also by the mass of common worldlings, who contented themselves with a mere formal and outward Christianity, for the purpose of begetting mistrust in every form of uncommon seriousness in the Christian life, which they were unable to discriminate from the monk-like tendency.

A Parisian theologian of the thirteenth century, Robert de Sorbonne, founder of the famous college that went by his name, says in his work on *Conscience*, — where he exhorts to rigid self-examination: "The Beguins, whether they are to be found in the world, or in the monkish orders, are wiser in this book (of Conscience), because they more frequently confess; for this reason they are denominated papellardi (pope-servants)."[5] He declaims against those, who, when amongst worldly people, dressed and lived like them, and spoke ill of the devout; while on the other hand, amongst the latter, they dressed in their fashion and begged for their intercessions.[6] "Such persons, who can trim their sails to every breeze that blows," says he, "the

[1] See ante, page 33.

[2] Berthold of Constance, at the year 1091: Non solum autem virorum et feminarum innumerabilis multitudo his temporibus se ad hujusmodi vitam contulerunt, ut sub obedientia clericorum sive monachorum communiter viverent eisque more ancillarum quotidiani servitii pensum devotissime persolverent, in ipsis quoque villis filiae rusticorum innumerae conjugio et seculo abrenuntiare et sub alicujus sacerdotis obedientia vivere studuerunt, sed etiam ipsae conjugatae nihilominus religiose vivere et religiosis cum summo devotione non cessaverunt obedire. He immediately adds: Multae villae ex integro se religioni contradiderunt seque invicem sanctitate morum praevenire incessabiliter studuerunt. Monumenta res Alemannicas illustrantia, t. ii, p. 148.

[3] See ante, page 285.

[4] See William of St. Amour, responsiones ad objecta, p. 92: Propter beguinas, bonos valetos, dicentes, quod vestis pretiosa portari non potest sine magno periculo.

[5] Bibliotheca patrum Lugd., t. xxv, f. 350.

[6] L. c. f. 348: Tales homines cum sint

world pronounces wise and liberal."[1] Those of the laity who led a stricter life, looked pale, and made it a point to swear no oath, — because they considered the words of Christ thus literally understood, if not as a commandment, yet as a *consilium evangelicum*, — were called by the sectarian name Catharists.[2] Peter Cantor opposes, to the severity with which men pronounced on the orthodoxy of others, their own extreme negligence with regard to morals. He says: "If we call every man, who wanders ever so little from the faith, a heretic, — why do we not, in like manner, complain of him who departs from the light of the moral law; why do we not say of him, that he walks not in the light, but in darkness?"[3] He complains of those who, by their quibbling glosses, let down the requisitions of the Christian moral law, as propounded in the sermon on the mount, and would convert the strait gate of salvation into a wide one.[4]

In order rightly to understand the shaping of the Christian life, and its extravagances in this period, we must present distinctly before our minds the peculiar mode of apprehending the order of salvation; for this will furnish a ground of explanation, or a point of attachment, for many things otherwise obscure. The tendency to the subjective — as we shall have to explain more at large in the section treating of doctrines — here predominated. Thus, for example, by justification, — which men considered as the necessary condition to the obtaining of salvation, as the sign of the elect, — was understood the internal work of making just, — sanctification through divine grace, which should manifest itself by good works proceeding from faith, and working by love (the *fides formata*). While now man's confidence, with reference to his salvation, was thus made to depend on something unsettled, subjective, and incapable of being defined by an infallible mark, the consequence was — according to the different characters and temperaments of men — either a one-sided spiritualization, or a one-sided externalization, of religion; either a reflection upon one's self, absorbing the whole man, till he was led to doubt of his salvation; or spiritual pride and work-holiness; — except where these evil results were prevented by the predominant reference which, in spite of the subjective element of the church doctrine, still prevailed in the religious life to the objective side of redemption. One class cast themselves upon

cum papellardis viris et religiosis, dicunt: orate pro me, et faciunt Magdalenam, et quando sunt cum mundanis, faciunt sicut mundani, vel pejus et detrectant de peregrinis et religiosis viris et derident, ut habeant benevolentiam mundanorum.

[1] De talibus dicit mundus, quod sapientes sunt et liberales, quia optime sciunt se habere cum omni genere hominum et quod bonum est tales promovere.

[2] Peter Cantor's words, verbum abbreviatum, c. cxxvii, p. 291: Si omnes alias perfectiones evangelicas ex voto possum suscipere et implere, quare et non similiter hoc consilium perfectionis? Vel cur hoc observantem statim proclamus Catharum? Concerning a person, who quia pauper et pallidus, was held to be a Catharist, l. c. p. 201.

[3] Si parum deviantem a fide vocamus haereticum et increpamus, dicentes eum non esse in via, sed extra, quare et similiter recedentem in modico a luce moralium praeceptorum non arguimus, objicientes ei, quod jam non sit in luce, sed tenebris. Verbum abbrev., c. lxxx, p. 213.

[4] Superflua expositione potius quam amore hanc portam adeo dilatavimus, quod jam angustias non habeat, ut sic intremus per latam portam, non per angustam. L. c. p. 211, et seqq.

externals, sought the warrant of their justification in the works of mortifying the flesh, of benevolence, donations to the church, in the frequent use of the sacraments; another class, consisting of persons of deeper feeling, looked within, and would attain to this assurance by watching the frames of their own mind, and thus, depending for their joy and their confidence on the changeful states of feelings oftentimes grounded in human weakness, they not seldom sought, by supernatural means, by visions, by special and extraordinary revelations, to obtain for themselves the assurance they were in quest of; easily falling a prey to fanaticism or to absolute despair, whereby many, especially of those who were beginners in the spiritual life, would be led, after seeing the fruitlessness of their efforts, to give themselves up again wholly to the world. The experienced spiritual guides of these centuries often speak of these several dangers, and seek to guard men against them. Thus, for example, Richard a S. Victore warns against spiritual pride, against work-holiness, as well as against moral despondency. In reference to the first he says: "We know that those good works which nourish the other virtues, almost always undermine humility. The works of abstinence and of patience, which excite the wonder of mankind, are wont to render those who perform them proud instead of humble."[1] In reference to the second he says: "When the soul, which has once despaired of its salvation, and is wholly deserted of the Holy Spirit, feels that it has no power to resist firmly-rooted habits, nor to restrain itself from the sin which cleaves to it, it is very apt to excuse itself, and to cast the blame upon its Maker. Men say, Everything must turn out as it has been foreordained. Who can resist the will of God? Can we create our own merits ourselves? In truth, nothing depends on our own willing or our own running, but everything upon the divine mercy. Why, then, does he not have mercy on us? Why does not he who works all in all, according to his will, work in us what is well-pleasing to himself?"[2]

By making their subjective feelings the ground of their assurance, men were the more troubled by those internal experiences which those, who find not their home in the present world, but labor after a secret divine life, must at all times have; — that interchange in the life of the soul between light and darkness, a lively feeling of grace and inward desolation. The lives of the pious men of this period, and of the mystics, are full of these experiences.[3] Richard a Sancto Victore calls this "the necessary darkness, the necessary vicissitude, of this present earthly life, where it cannot always be day, as it is in heaven, but the sun rises and sets."[4]

[1] De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. xxx.

[2] De eruditione interioris hom. p. i, l. iii, c. xviii. Caesarius, in his Narrations, Distinct. c. xxvii, cites the instance of a prince who, upon every exhortation to repentance, replied that, if he belonged to the elect, he should be saved at all events; and, if he did not, all the efforts he might make would avail nothing. See above, p. 239.

[3] See History of Monachism, cited p. 239.

[4] Quare ergo omne cor moeret, nisi quia nullum cor perpetuum diem hic habet, quia lumen coeli semper praesens habere non valet. Oritur enim sol et occidit et ad locum suum revertitur. Quid ergo mirum, si omne cor moeret, quamdiu necessarias

The heavily-oppressed spirits often felt themselves relieved as by a gift from Heaven, when the deep, dull pain of the soul, thirsting after the fountain of its life and longing after its home, could find vent in tears, that "donum lachrymarum" of which so much is said in the testimonies concerning the internal life of this period. There was no want of important voices which expressed themselves emphatically against that externalization of religion in isolated good works, and which pointed those, whose minds were solely directed to things outward and individual, to that which is required in order to true piety. In a sermon on Luke 11: 41, pope Innocent the Third extols above all other good works, that of almsgiving. He says: "Almsgiving is more than fasting; since what the man denies to himself he gives to others. It is more than prayer, because it is better to pray with deeds than with words." At the same time, however, he guards against a misapprehension of those words of Christ which he took for his text, by the remark: "But if the power of almsgiving is so great, men may do what they please, provided only they diligently bestow alms, secure in their reliance on those words of our Lord. Will, then, all things be pure to them that give alms, even to drunkards, to adulterers, to murderers, and to those who are stained with all the other pollutions of crime? May they, then, securely abandon themselves to all their pleasures, because alms suffice to redeem them from all sins? Far from it; since, as holy writ declares, Lev. xv, whatever is touched by the unclean, becomes unclean. God looks rather upon *how* a thing is done than upon *what* is done."[1] And he quotes, in opposition to this false view of alms, the words of the apostle Paul: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity," etc. True almsgiving proceeds, then, from love unfeigned. He raises the objection: "But I am poor; I have no bread, no clothing, no alms to bestow; nothing that I can give to others." And he answers: "But recollect that with God the good will sufficeth, where the opportunity is wanting." And: "God regards, in the gift, not so much its magnitude as the measure of piety in the act of bestowing it."[2] Bishop Hildebert of Mans wrote to a certain count of Angers, who was about starting on a pilgrimage to St. Jago di Compostella,[3] "We deny not that this is a good thing, but he who undertakes a calling is obligated to obedience. And he sins, if he forsake it without being called to something greater and more useful. Wherefore, look forward to thy great guilt, thou who preferrest that which is not necessary, to the necessary; repose, to activity in thy calling. Among the talents which the Master of the house gave to his servants to administer, no teacher nor passage of the Holy Scriptures mentions roving about in the world. But perhaps it will be said, the man is bound by a vow; recollect that

tenebras hujusmodi alternantium vicissitudinum sustinet? Quamdiu in terra vivimus, quamdiu in terra sumus, has temporum vicissitudines necessario sustinemus. In coelo dies sine nocte. De statu interioris hominis Tract. i, p. i, c. xxvii.

[1] Deus magis attendit modum in facto, quam factum in modo. id est quo modo aliquid fiat, quam quid aliquo modo fiat. De eleemosyna, c. iii, f. 201.

[2] Nec tam attendit in munere quantitatem, quam devotionem in opere, pensans magis ex quanto, quam quantum

[3] Ep. xv.

thou hast bound *thyself* by thy vow, but God has bound thee by the duties of thy calling." And he then goes on to explain more at large how, with self-renunciation, he ought to fulfil his duties as a ruler, govern himself by the laws, his subordinates with love;[1] not stroll about to the churches of the saints, but bear within him the lively remembrance of their virtues."[2] Concerning pilgrimages, Raymund Lull, in his work on Contemplation, expresses himself as follows: he first compares the procession of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem,[3]—the pilgrims riding at their ease, living comfortably, and bearing the cross only on their cloaks; he contrasts what Christ did to seek men, with what they do to seek him: "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, whilst thou art so near that every man, if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber. Why are multitudes so ignorant as to travel away into distant lands to seek thee, carrying evil spirits with them, if they depart laden with sin? The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they meet in taverns and churches, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage. He who would find thee, O Lord, let him go forth to seek thee in love, loyalty, devotion, faith, hope, justice, mercy, and truth; for in every place where these are, there art thou. Blessed, then, are all they who seek thee in such things. The things which a man would find, he should seek earnestly; and he must seek in the place where they are to be found. If, then, the pilgrims would find thee, they must carefully seek thee; and they must not seek thee in the images and paintings of churches, but in the hearts of holy men, in which thou dwellest day and night. The mode and the way to find thee stands within the power of man; for to remember thee, to love thee, to honor, to serve thee; to think of thine exalted dignity and on our own great wants,—this is the occasion and the way to find thee, if we seek thee. Often have I sought thee on the cross, and my bodily eyes have not been able to find thee, although they have found thine image there, and a representation of thy death. And when I could not find thee with my bodily eyes, I have sought thee with the eye of my soul; and, thinking on thee, my soul found thee; and when it found thee, my heart began immediately to warm with the glow of love, my eyes to weep, my mouth to praise thee. How little profits it the pilgrims to roam through the world in quest of thee, if, when they have come back from their pilgrimage, they return again to sin and folly." Bishop William of Paris, another distinguished man among the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century, says, in one of his sermons: "The true pilgrimage is this,—to travel, by penitence, to the heavenly Jerusalem. This pilgrimage is more glorious than all others, for the reason that the others are performed for the sake of this; and, where this is wanting, the others are useless." The same bishop remarks, in another sermon:

[1] Te ipsum legibus, amore subjectos rege. sed circumferre memoriam virtutum.
[2] Nec circumferri per memorias lapidum,
[3] Cap. cxiii, f. 252.

"They present their bodies, not as a living but as a dead sacrifice, who say, I will cause myself to be buried and remain, after my death, in this or that order, while they continue to live on in their sins." The abbot Bernard of Tiron,[1] said to the monks assembled around his dying bed: "All virtue, besides love, is perishable; in this, consists the essence of all God's commandments; by this alone, the disciples of Christ are distinguished from the servants of antichrist. By this alone, will men recognize them as Christ's disciples, not by the circumstance that they observed superstitious ordinances; these promoted sin far more than edification." He lamented that he had been so long a slave to such outward ordinances, and had laid such a yoke upon others.[2]

Many bright testimonies of this Christian spirit, that pointed away from the outward to the inward, we find in the works of Raymund Lull. We will cite a few of them. "The figure of the holy cross," says he, "laments over those hypocrites who simulate the poverty and suffering represented by it, with a view to appear as saints to the people, and who are unwilling to follow after it by the performance of real good works.[3] We see the holy cross honored with gold, silver, precious stones, silks, and paintings of various colors; but we see it little honored by love, tears, contrition, devotion, and holy thoughts; and yet the wooden cross, before which a sinner weeps, receives more honor than the cross of gold, before which a sinner stands thinking of the vanities of the world.[4] The image of the crucified Christ is found much rather in men who imitate him in their daily walk, than in a crucifix made of wood."[5] All the Christian virtues he represents as signs of that constitution of soul which is requisite in order to salvation;[6] "but from these signs," says he, "it is still impossible to know whether one is in the way of salvation, because that which shows itself in outward appearance is no certain expression of the disposition within, on which alone everything depends. For those persons who fast, give alms, and speak words of humility, clothe themselves in rags, and subject themselves to many self-denials, may yet, with all this, unite a false bent of the inward temper.[7] And others may eat and sleep well, and wear comfortable garments, who do this with a good intention, and to avoid making a parade of their piety."[8] "The poor man, when he gives a small morsel of bread, in true piety and contrition, to another poor man, is more benefited than the rich man, who gives the poor bread and meat from vanity and in a false intention."[9] "A small

[1] See above, p. 236.

[2] In hoc solo cognoscent homines, quia Christi sitis discipuli, non si superstitiosarum observatores traditionum extiteritis, sed si dilectionem ad invicem habueritis. Concerning the former he says, quibus non parvo tempore ipse subjacueram, quasque aliis per nonnulla annorum curricula instanter ferendas imposueram. Acta S. Mens. April, t. ii, f. 249.

[3] Conqueritur, quia ipsi eam in se fingunt, ut videantur a gentibus in similitudinem bonorum hominum, et nolunt ipsam imitari faciendo vera esse opera.

[4] Majorem honorationem recipit crux lignea, coram qua peccator plorat, quam crux aurea, coram qua peccator stat memorando vanitates hujus mundi.

[5] Quoniam figura, quam videmus in cruce, est pictura in ligno, sed beatus religiosus est illius speciei, cujus est tua gloriosa humanitas. Liber contemplationis, vol. ii, Distinct. 23, c. cxxiii, t. ix, f. 280.

[6] Omnes virtutes signa et significationes et demonstrationes salvationis.

[7] Possunt habere in istis rebus falsam et inordinatam intentionem.

[8] L. c. f. 461. [9] L. c. f. 184.

piece of money, which the poor man gives out of love to God, is more than a large sum which the rich man bestows in such intention; and the rich man is more acceptable before God when, from love to God, he is humble, simple, and courteous, than the poor man who, from love to God, is the same."[1] Prayer, he describes as the soul of the Christian life. "It is ordained of God as the ladder, by which man mounts from this dark place to the eternal glory. As often as man begins to pray, while praising and loving God, testifying of his goodness and acknowledging his own wretchedness, so often he begins to mount upward to God. Prayer converts the proud man into an humble one, the disdainful man into a simple and courteous one."[2] "A man better defends himself against temptation with prayer than with fasting."[3] "Devotion in prayer is so good a thing, that the prayer of uneducated men or women, who pray in rude language, but with great devotion, is far more acceptable than the prayer of the great and learned, and of prelates, who pray with fine words but without devotion; since they have their hearts and their imaginations set on other things, quite at variance with those denoted by their words."[4] He called that acceptable prayer to God, which aims at obtaining the forgiveness of sin, humility, wisdom, love. "But many," says he, "pray daily for the glory of paradise, and yet in their hearts love the joys of this world more than the glory they pray for; and as they love the goods of this world more than those of the other, they are not worthy of attaining to the celestial goods."[5] He distinguishes three kinds of prayer,—prayer in words (the *oratio sensualis*); the internal prayer of the spirit (*oratio intellectualis*), and that embracing the whole life. "He who is just, compassionate, humble, patient, prays, although he is not consciously thinking of God. To this act belong all works which pious men perform. Whatsoever such a person may do, whether he eat, or drink, or sleep, buy or sell, dig or plough, he prays to God and praises God."[6] The temper which should be the soul of the Christian life, he represents as love, concerning whose holy fervor he could testify more fully than any other individual. "As the needle," says he, "when touched by the magnet, points naturally to the north, so must thy servant turn thither to love and praise God his Lord, and to serve him; since from love to him the Lord has been willing to endure heavy pains and sufferings in this world."[7]

Among his spirited aphorisms we find the following, which belong here. "He who bestows on his friend his love, bestows on him more than if he gave him treasures of gold; he who gives God, *can* give nothing more,"[8] (alluding to the words of the apostle John, that God

[1] L. c. f. 162. [2] L. c. f. 125.

[3] Homo melius se defendit a tentatione cum oratione quam cum jejunio. De centum nominibus Dei, c. ii, t. vi, f. 23.

[4] De contemplatione Dei, vol. ii, l. iii, Dist. 29, c cc, f. 498. [5] L. c. f. 499.

[6] L. c. vol. iii, l. v, Dist. 40, c. cccxv, t. x, f. 339.

[7] Sicut acus per naturam vertitur ad septentrionem, dum sit tacta a magnete, ita oportet, quod tuus servus se vertat ad amandum et laudandum suum Dominum Deum, et ad serviendum ei, quoniam pro suo amore voluit in hoc mundo sustinere graves dolores et graves passiones. De contemplatione Dei, vol. ii, l. iii, Dist. 27, c. cxxx, t. ix, f. 296.

[8] Qui dat bonum amare suo amico, illi

is love.) With this saying, we may compare what Richard a Sancto Victore remarks, on the other hand, concerning those who sow contentions. "He treats you in a godless manner, who robs you of your money; but how is it with him who deprives you of love? Does he treat you cruelly who robs you of your garment? how much more, then, he who deprives you of love. For if it is cruel to rob a man of his outward and perishable goods, it must be still more so to deprive him of the internal, ever-abiding goods; for charity never ceases. Of a truth, whoever deprives a man of love, deprives him also of God, for God is love."[1] Again, says Raymund Lull: "He who loves not, lives not."[2] "The spirit longs after nothing as it does after God. No gold is worth so much as a sigh of holy longing. The more of this longing one has, the more of life he has. The want of this longing is death. Have this longing, and thou shalt live. He is not poor who possesses this; unhappy the man who lives without it."[3] "Were there no sin," says he, "all temporal goods would be held in common by all." The activity of love in almsgiving, he considered as that whereby all those distinctions which had proceeded from sin, were to be again done away.[4]

Although an enthusiastic admirer of monasticism, yet Raymund Lull objected to an excessive asceticism, or one that does not spring out of the temper of love; and places the love that unites together the practical and contemplative life, and is active in promoting the salvation of others, above everything else. "The body which has been too much mortified," says he, "is suited for neither the active nor the contemplative life. Thou wilt be a murderer, if thou destroyest thyself slowly, as much as if thou doest it at once. God does not bestow earthly blessings on men for nothing; as thou must eat in order to live, so thou must not fast in order to die. Hypocrisy steals upon those who impose on themselves excessive mortification."[5] "No hermit does so much good as a good preacher, who has the contemplative life in himself, and shows the practical in his preaching. Better is a life spent in instructing others, than one spent in fasting."[6]

In his great work concerning Contemplation in God, Raymund Lull exhibits, in all the ranks and professions of Christendom, the contrast between what they are and what they ought to be,[7] and points away

plus dat, quam si illi daret omne aurum; qui dat Deum, non potest plus dare. De centum nominibus Dei, c. xxxi, t. vi, f. 15.

[1] De eruditione interioris hominis, p. i, l. iii, c. iv, f. 107.

[2] Qui non amat, non vivit. Liber proverbiorum, c. xvii, t. vi, f. 10.

[3] Qui plus desiderat, plus scit de vivere. Privatio desiderii est mori. Desidera et vives. Non est pauper, qui desiderat. Tristis vivit, qui non desiderat. De centum nominibus Dei, c. xc, Lib. Proverbiorum, p. i, t. vi, f. 38.

[4] Si peccatum non esset, omnia temporalia bona essent communia. Eleemosyna est figura communis boni. Prov. moral. c. lxx, t. vi, f. 119.

[5] Proverb. moral. c. lxix, f. 119.

[6] Nullus eremita facit tantum bonum, sicut bonus praedicator, qui habet vitam contemplativam in se ipso et activam in praedicando. Vita est melior per doctrinam, quam per jejunium. L. c. p. iii, c. li, f. 110.

[7] As this work will be accessible to but few of my readers, I have thought it might be agreeable to them if I should quote a few passages from Raymund Lull on this point. He speaks earnestly against the manner in which princes abusing their power, acted in contradiction to their high

from the corruption of all, to Christ. While he thus treats of princes and nobles, and complains that no access is to be found to them, when it is needed in reference to the matters for which they are placed over others,—for the gates of the palaces are shut, and the porters threaten those who would enter them; he thereupon betakes himself to God and says, "Praised then, be thou, that the case is not so with thee,—for as often as man would see thee, contemplate thee, address thee, he can do so, and the door is never shut."[1]

We will quote in addition a few things from the sayings of the Franciscan, Aegidius of Assisi, a friend of Francis of Assisi, as testimonies of the internal Christian life, the internal Christian experience, of these times: "One grace draws after it another, and one crime draws after it another."[2] "Grace cannot bear to be praised, nor crime to be despised. Purity of heart *sees* God, devotion *enjoys* him. While a man lives, he must not despair of God's mercy; for there is no tree so distorted that human art cannot make it straight again; — *a fortiori*, there is no person in the world whose sins are so grievous that God cannot adorn him with grace and virtues. All love of the creature is nothing in comparison with love of the Creator. Only through humility can man attain to the knowledge of God; the path upward begins downward.[3] It is better to suffer a heavy wrong, without murmuring, out of love to God, than to feed daily a hundred poor, and to fast many days far into the night. What does it profit a man to despise himself and to mortify his body with fasting, prayer, vigils, and self-scourging, if he is not able to endure a wrong from his neighbor, which would bring him greater reward than all the mortifications he imposes on himself? Should the Lord rain stones from heaven, they would not harm us, if we were what we ought to be. If a man were what he ought to be, evil would for him transform itself into good; for all great good, and all great evil, are within the man, where none can see them. It is a great virtue to conquer one's self; if thou conquerest thyself, thou wilt conquer all thine enemies. Every man has just so much knowledge and wisdom as he performs good deeds." When Aegidius came in contact with persons who dreaded undertaking any good thing, for fear that vanity might mix in and spoil the whole, said

calling, ut teneant pacem in terra et ut gentes secure possint ire per vias et secure manere in suis domibus. He says of them, quod totum mundum teneant in bello et labore. And he expresses his surprise, quod tam pauci homines teneant in labore tot gentes, quot sunt in hoc mundo. He says that the majority of them ipsi se faciant servos vilium hominum. He speaks of their love of the chase; he describes how they excused themselves on the plea that this was their *relaxation;* and thus pretending that by such pursuits they avoided sin; sed non attendunt ad malos procuratores, quos relinquunt loco sui et qui sunt populo sicut lupi voraces et dum ipsi venantur et se recreant, lupi comedunt oves sibi commissas. In complaining of the cupidity, the ambition, and the ignorance of *physicians* (quia operantur in infirmis plus casualiter, quam certa scientia, ideo plures homines occiduntur quam sanantur a medicis), he recommends, as the best practice of medicine, that the patient should study his own case, find out what ails him, et caveat, ne utatur rebus contrariis et sinat operari in se cursum naturae.

[1] Igitur benedictus sis, quia non est ita de te, quoniam quotiescunque homo velit videre te et contemplando loqui tecum, semper potest, nunquam januae sunt clausae vol. ii, l. iii, Distinct. xxiii, c. cxi, 4. ix, f. 247.

[2] Gratia attrahit gratiam et unum vitium trahit ad aliud.

[3] Via eundi sursum est ire deorsum.

he, "Be not withheld by this from doing good. If the husbandman, when about to scatter his seed on the earth, should say within himself, , I will not sow this year, for fear the birds may come and devour the seed,' he would afterwards find himself in want of food to supply his wants. But if he sow, and it should really happen that some of his seed perishes, yet the greatest portion will remain to him. So is it with him who is tempted with the love of fame and fights against it." Speaking of the inexhaustible store of the knowledge of God yet in reserve for man, he said: "The entire Holy Scriptures speak to us as it were with a lisping tongue, as a mother talks to her little child; because, otherwise, it would be unable to understand her words."[1]

It is true, the love of the wonderful prevailed very generally, and the lives of the saints, in order to be popular with the multitude, must needs say a good deal about their miracles.[2] But neither were there wanting those who combated this tendency; and from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries onwards, a series of testimonies might be cited on the true import and significance of the miracle, in its relation to the divine life; and against the overvaluation of the externally wonderful. —thoughts which are not barely the property of a few enlightened individuals elevated above their times, but which may be considered as expressing the common Christian consciousness of these centuries.[3] The monk Stephen, who in the twelfth century described the life of his master, the abbot Stephen of Obaize, a man distinguished for his pious and influential activity, adduces no miracle of his; but asserts that, for this reason, he stands not inferior to that active wonder-worker, Martin of Tours; for, to awaken so many men and women, who were sunk in all manner of vice, by repentance, to eternal life, was a far greater work than if he had awakened them from natural death.[4] The author of the life of the abbot Bernard of Tiron says, in his preface to that work: "If any, following the pattern of Jewish unbelief, seek after miracles, and would estimate the character of the saints solely according to the number of these, what would he say of Mary, or of John the Baptist? But in the day of judgment many who wrought miracles will be rejected, and those alone attain to salvation who have striven after works of righteousness. We praise then our father Bernard, not for the reason that he wrought miracles (although these were not wholly wanting), — but we set him forth as one who meekly, humbly, and from his heart followed in the steps of our Lord Christ."[5] "Visible miracles," says the author of the life of Norbert, "may properly excite the wonder of the simple and ignorant; but the patient endurance and virtues of the saints are worthy of the ad-

[1] Tota sacra scriptura loquitur nobis tanquam balbutiendo, sicut mater balbutiens cum filio suo parvulo, qui aliter non potest intelligere verba ejus. Acta Sanct. Mens. April, t. iii, f. 227, seqq.

[2] Quod maxime nunc exigitur ab his, qui sanctorum vitas describere volunt. The preface to the life of the abbot Stephen of Obaize, which was composed by his disciple, Stephen. Baluz. Miscellan. iv, p. 69.

[3] Comp. the passages already cited, p. 306

[4] After having spoken of the great numbers of unchaste women converted by him, he says: Qui ergo de talibus poenitentiae remedio et praevenientis gratiae dono castas atque mundissimas Christo sponsas exhibuit, non dubito majoris hoc fuisse virtutis, quam si eas corpore mortuas suscitasset. In the preface to the second book of the Life, iv. f. 106.

[5] Acta Sanct. Mens. April, t. ii, f. 223.

miration, and of the imitation, of those who would be soldiers of Christ." [1]

From the time of this new excitement of the religious life in the beginning of the twelfth century, the want of preaching in the native languages of the different countries became deeply felt, and the more complete formation of these languages was brought about at the time most convenient to meet this want; as the German language had already been found peculiarly well adapted to sacred poetry.[2] It is very evident how fervently the people greeted those ecclesiastics and monks who travelled about as preachers of repentance; and it was the same state of feeling, moreover, that procured such a rush of hearers for those who used their influence with the people in combating the doctrines of the church and diffusing heretical principles. The church would be compelled, therefore, by the interest of self-preservation, to bestow more attention on the management of the predicatorial office. Several writings appeared, which treated of this subject. We may first mention here the work of the abbot Guibert, of Novigentum, on the right method of preaching.[3] He declared it to be the general duty of Christians, and not confined solely to bishops and abbots to labor for the advancement of the Christian life in others, according to the proportion of each man's knowledge and gifts. "Suppose one be neither a bishop nor an abbot, still, he is a Christian. If he would live a Christian life, he must honor the Christian name, as in himself so also in others." He requires of the preacher that he should have respect to the wants of the simple and uneducated as well as of the better-informed; that he should endeavor to unite depth with lucidity and plainness of meaning.[4] "Let the sermon," says he, "be preceded by prayer; so that the soul, fired with divine love, may utter forth what it feels of God, with glowing words; so that the preacher, as he burns in his own heart, may enkindle a flame also in the hearts of his hearers." He required, especially, that the sermon should contain ethical matter. "The preacher should treat concerning the motions of the inner man. This was a thing so common to the experience of all men, that such a sermon could be obscure to none. Every man could read in his own heart, written as it were in a book, what he heard said of the various kinds of temptation.[5] No sermon was more useful than that which showed men to themselves, and led back those who, by the distraction of outward things, had become estranged from themselves to the secret recesses of their hearts; presenting them, as if reflected from a mirror, before their own eyes."[6] "But as, in describing a battle in the field, he who took part

[1] Visibilia miracula simplicibus et idiotis stupenda sunt, patientia vero et virtutes sanctorum his, qui ad Christi militiam se accingunt, admirandae sunt et imitandae. Mens. Jun. t. i, f. 824.

[2] Tota terra jubilat in Christi laudibus etiam per cantilenas linguae vulgaris, maxime in Teutonicis, quorum lingua magis apta est concinnis canticis. See the words of Gerhoh of Reichersberg, quoted on p. 155.

[3] Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat.

[4] Ut idiotis ac simplicibus perspicuum, quod dicitur, esse queat.

[5] Praesertim cum unusquisque intra seipsum quasi in libro scriptum attendat, quicquid de diversis tentationibus praedicatoris lingua retractat.

[6] Nulla enim praedicatio salubrior mihi videtur, quam illa, quae hominem sibimet ostendat et foras extra se sparsum in interiori suo restituat atque eum congruens

in the fight, will be able to give an entirely different account of it from one who knows nothing about it except from the report of others, so is it with the spiritual warfare. He whose own conscience bears witness to that which he expresses in words, will treat of spiritual conflicts with an altogether different sort of authority, and be able to point as it were with his finger to all the particulars."[1]

We ought especially to mention here a work abounding in good matter, and worthy of the special consideration of those times, in which, in the thirteenth century, Humbert de Romanis,[2] general of the order of Dominicans, endeavored to set forth to the members of his order the obligation incumbent on them of preaching the gospel; the gravity and dignity of this vocation; and the qualifications requisite for the right discharge of it.[3] Of all the spiritual exercises in which the monks employed themselves, he describes preaching as the most excellent; and declares that whoever possessed the talent for it, was bound to cultivate it most assiduously.[4] It was more than all fasting and all mortification of the body; for all these bodily exercises, according to 1 Timothy iv, profit but little; but preaching effected much good. Besides, an indigent preacher, truly zealous for the salvation of souls, had more to suffer than all those mortifications could amount to which a man imposes on himself. He cites, in confirmation of this, the remark of a man that had passed over from the Cistercian to the Dominican order, and affirmed, that he "had had more to suffer in a few days, when he itinerated as a preacher, than during the whole time he had spent in his old order. Other monks busied themselves with works of charity pertaining to the body; but preaching was as much above these as the soul is more than the body." He refers to the words of Christ, Luke 9: 60, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." He sets preaching above prayer; above the study of the sacred Scriptures, if they are not studied as a help to preaching; above the celebration of the mass, and the liturgical acts of worship; "for of the Latin liturgy the laity understand nothing; but they can understand the sermon; and hence, by preaching, God is glorified in a clearer and more open manner than by other acts of worship."[5] Furthermore, he appeals to the example of Christ: "Christ celebrated the mass but once; heard no confessions; seldom administered the sacraments; did not employ himself much in the liturgical adoration of God; but he was constantly engaged in prayer and preaching. Indeed, after he had once com-

quodammodo depictum ante faciem suam statuat.

[1] This tract of Guibert forms the introduction to his work on the exposition of Genesis, in ten books, in which he aims to show how everything in holy Scripture may be applied to a moral end, and so made use of for preaching. He was induced to undertake this work by a prior, who heard a sermon of his, and requested him to compose a work for himself, from which he might learn how to work everything into matter for preaching (ut id sibi scriberem, in quo materiam sumendi cujuscunque sermonis acciperet). See his Tract, De vita sua, lib. i, f. 477.

[2] So named from his native town, Romans, in Burgundy.

[3] His work, De eruditione praedicatorum, in two books, published in the twenty-fifth volume of the Bibliotheca patrum, Lugd.

[4] Lib. i, c. xx.

[5] In praedicatione intelligunt, quae dicuntur, et ideo per praedicationem clarius et apertius laudatur Deus.

menced preaching, he spent his whole life in that employment, much more than in prayer." He dwells on the great effects which sermons might produce in his own times; describes how the multitude ran after them.[1] He relates that certain ecclesiastics had discussed together, before an eminent archbishop, the question what good has been effected by the multitude of sermons preached by the new order of monks, since vice and crime prevail in the world to as great a degree as ever? Upon this, the archbishop remarked, "As there is still so much vice, and those good men have been the means of extirpating so much by their preaching, what would the case have been, if such preachers had never appeared?"[2] Humbert examines into the hindrances by which many were prevented from preaching, with a view of depriving those whom he would urge to engage in it of all grounds of excuse. "Thus, some," he said, "were kept back by the love of contemplative quiet; such had the more to answer for, in proportion to the good they might have done by public activity. Others were hindered through dread of the temptations to sin." He meets the case of such by saying, "It is sometimes better for men to toil, even though by toiling they may cover themselves with dust, than to sit always in perfect tidyness at home. Others deferred the work too long, from the desire of attaining to a certain degree of perfection, which perhaps they would never reach."[3] He says to them: "The friends sleep, and meantime the house is on fire; an enemy breaks in, and yet they cannot arouse themselves." Others were deterred by dread of the want to which they must expose themselves in preaching the gospel. Before such he holds up the poverty of Christ, and asks, "What preacher, of the present age, would have to suffer want to that degree as not to be able to find, at least in populous cities, the necessary means for the support of life? Others were intimidated by the perverseness of many of the prelates, who sought to hinder the preaching which it was much more their duty to encourage; as the scribes and pharisees had done among the Jews, and the priests among the pagans."[4] He calls upon the preacher to go about everywhere; and to labor wherever there was need of it. "What sort of preachers are those who would always remain inactive at home?"[5] We may observe how the zeal with which the heretics, that appeared in opposition to the church, labored to propagate their doctrines, served to call forth a reaction on the part of those who were engaged in the service of the church. He holds up the example of the former as worthy of imitation; describing their incessant activity in running about to houses and villages, at the hazard of their lives, for the purpose of leading souls astray.[6] But at the same time, he warns against the false zeal of an indiscreet obtrusiveness, advising his monks not to

[1] Interdum ista devotio facit multos sequi praedicatorem, sicut visum est in diebus nostris frequenter. Lib. i, c. iv.

[2] Lib. i, c. ii.

[3] Praeparatio nimis morosa ad hoc officium.

[4] Lib. i, c. xvi to xxi: Sunt multi praelati, qui non solum non praedicant, sed etiam ne alii, qui hoc laudabiliter possunt facere, faciant prohibent.

[5] Quales ergo praedicatores sunt, qui semper quiescere volunt in domibus vel in castris suis. L. c. c. xxi.

[6] Haeretici cum periculo corporis non cessant per domos et villas discurrere, ut pervertant animas. L. c. c. xxxi.

appear in improper places; not to hold forth, as many did, at markets and fairs; since in these places men were wholly engrossed in worldly affairs, and reverence for the divine word could not fail to suffer injury; but to choose befitting spots, as Paul preached in the synagogues, and our Lord in the temple, or even in the open fields, where the attention of men was not liable to be diverted by worldly occupations.[1]

He furthermore gives many admonitions and warnings to preachers with regard to the right method of preaching: "Though the talent for preaching," he says, "is obtained through the special gift of God, yet the wise preacher will do his own part of the work, and diligently study, in order that he may preach correctly." But he warns against a mistake committed by many, who were for making a display of their own ingenuity and eloquence, and, as the people of Athens required, were ever on the search for something new to say.[2] Thus he unites in the same censure which the opponent of his order, William of St. Amour, pronounces against the preachers of the two mendicant orders, — that they lacked the simplicity of the gospel, and affected to exhibit themselves as philosophers.[3] "But the good preacher," said he, "would aim rather at that which might prove useful, — which might serve to promote devotion." He declaims against excessive prolixity and frequent repetitions in sermons, — against those who were for displaying their ingenuity in deriving the theme of their discourse from a text altogether foreign from the matter in hand.[4] Such tricks would rather excite derision than promote edification.[5] He speaks against those who looked more to fine words than to the thoughts; comparing them with people who took more pains to make a display of beautiful dishes, than of good food upon them.[6]

With regard to the effects produced by preaching, he says,[7] "Many hear the word of God with great delight; but it is the same as if they were listening to a beautiful song. Others experience a great effect on their feelings for the moment; but it is of no benefit to them, because, after the sermon, they become immediately cold again." He applies to them 1 Kings, 19: 11, "The Lord was not in the whirlwind." "Others," says he, "are good judges of preaching, — he has spoken well or badly, say they; the sermon was too long, too short, too abstruse, too trivial, — but they never think of applying what is said to their own lives."

He takes particular notice, also, of the different ranks and occupations of men, and hints at the kind of instruction suited to each. Of

[1] L. c. c. xvii.

[2] Sunt quidam praedicatores, qui cum student ad praedicandum, interdum applicant studium suum circa subtilia, volentes plectere et texere subtilia circa nova, more Atheniensium vocantes ad dicendum nova, interdum circa sophismata, linguam suam volentes magnificare. Lib. i, c. vi.

[3] De periculis novissimorum temporum, l. c. p. 71: Quod veri Apostoli non intendunt nec innituntur rationibus logicis aut philosophicis. Illi ergo praedicatores, qui hujus modi rationibus innituntur, non sunt veri Apostoli, sed pseudo.

[4] Thus, one who would treat concerning the apostles Peter and Paul, took for his text Numbers 3: 20.

[5] Solet autem accidere frequenter, quod hujusmodi themata extranea non possunt aptari, nisi cum magna et incongrua extorsione sententiae et ideo potius inducunt derisionem quam aedificationem.

[6] Lib. i, c. vi.

[7] L. c. c. xxvi

the great, as well as of the poor, he says, that they seldom visited the churches,— which were mostly frequented therefore by persons of the middle class,— and hence, the opportunity of addressing them ought to be the more carefully improved. As it was but seldom they heard sermons, it was a work of love for the preacher, whenever he could find them together and have access to them, to address them the word of exhortation, for they greatly needed it.[1] And he exhorts the preacher to set home upon the great, the duties which they owed to their inferiors. "The poor," says he, "come seldom to church,— seldom to hear preaching,— for this reason they know little about things that minister to salvation; and hence, if they are ever found collected at church, or elsewhere, they should be instructed in that which it concerns all Christians to know."[2] He instances the case where numbers come together in large ships, thus furnishing an opportunity for any who may be disposed to preach to them.[3] The sensuous bent of devotion paid but little regard to preaching, and hence Humbert laments over the case of the poor women, who knew no better than to neglect the preached word; busying themselves, while it was delivering, either in repeating their prayers, in kneeling before the images, or in taking the holy water.[4] When it was seen that a pope, like Innocent the Third, would not allow himself to be deterred, by the enormous pressure of his affairs, from the zealous preaching of the word,[5] — this fact would doubtless serve to beget in many a high sense of the importance of the predicatorial office in its bearing on church life. We hear this pope himself lamenting in his sermons that, by the great multitude of affairs which demanded his attention, he was prevented from bestowing the care which he wished to expend on the composition and delivery of his discourses. Yet he was unwilling to remain wholly silent on festival occasions, though he could not accomplish what he would have been glad to do.[6] His sermons bear witness to his earnest zeal for the advancement of practical Christianity, in opposition to a certain superstition which resisted it; and of this, we have already cited some examples. He protested strongly, amongst other things, against a superstitious and excessive image-worship, which he calls a species of idolatry.[7] Concerning the greatest teacher of scientific theology of his age, Thomas Aquinas, it is related that he took the utmost pains to preach plainly, in the Italian language, and to abstain from all matters which would not contribute to the edification of the people, by whom he was listened to with great reverence.[8]

[1] Lib. ii, c. lxxxiii.
[2] L. ii, c. xxxvi.
[3] L. c. c. xci.
[4] L. c. c. ci.
[5] Humbert de Romanis relates that, on a certain high festival, he delivered before the people a homily, writen by Gregory the Great on this festival, and translated into the vernacular tongue. L. c. lib. i, c. vi.
[6] S. i, Quadrages: Saepe necessitas impedit, quod requirit utilitas, quod ipse nunc experiri compellor. Requirit enim utilitas, ut his sacris diebus frequentius solito per exhortationes sermonum debeam populos admonere, sed impedit hoc necessitas, quia praeter solitum imo plus solito multis et magnis sum occupatus negotiis, ut nullum mihi sit otium otiosum. Opp. ed. Colon. 1575, f. 40.
[7] Quid est, quod quidam sub praetextu pietatis et obtentu religionis, ut caetera taceam, diversas adorant imagines, tanquam liceat manufactum aliquid adorare? In Dedicat. templi, s. iii, f. 75.
[8] Praedicationes suas, quibus placeret Deo, prodesset populo, sic formabat, ut non esset in curiosis humanae sapientiae verbis, sed in spiritu et virtute sermonis, qui evitatis, quae curiositati potius quam utilitati

From the middle of the thirteenth century to the year 1272, in which he died, the Franciscan Berthold held the first rank as a preacher of repentance in the cities of Regensburg and Augsburg. His labors were extended from Bavaria to Thuringia, and far into Switzerland. He was invited to preach first in one city, and then in another. No church was large enough to hold the multitudes that came to hear him. He often preached in the open fields, where a pulpit had been erected for him, with more than sixty thousand people assembled around him. He fearlessly rebuked the vices of all ranks of society, high and low, rich and poor. Many were converted under his preaching, and freely confessed their sins to him. Among this number were women of very immodest habits of life, who immediately abandoned their dishonest calling, and were married by him to husbands, after he had collected from the crowds that hung upon his lips the amount of alms required for their dowry. He was revered as a prophet and a worker of miracles.[1]

His sermons, couched in nervous and pithy German, breathe a genuine spirit of practical Christianity, which, although still cramped and confined within the narrow limits of the church doctrine, yet stood forth in zealous opposition to all the superstition and outside Christianity which merely served as a prop to sin, foretokening the great reformatory tendency which was destined to proceed forth at a future day from German monasticism.[2] We will here cite a few of his sayings, in illustration of these remarks. Speaking of the worth of virtue, he says: "While God Almighty created all things for our use, yet there is *one* which, in value and profit, far exceeds all the rest. And therefore you should use all diligence to make sure of this; for he who is without it, never beholds God and his holy angels, in their joys and in their glory. And that you may love it as long as you live, I will name it to you: it is called Virtue. For the Almighty God is all virtue; and he created men and angels for no other purpose than that we might become partakers of his joys and of his glory. By this virtue, God created angels and men; and as he himself can be nothing other than absolute virtue and pure virtue, so it is his will that angels and men should also be virtuous. But then," says he, "virtue is something other than what the world commonly calls by that name, applying it to him who can gracefully convey a message, carry a dish, or present a

deserviunt, in illo suo vulgari natalis soli proponebat et prosequebatur utilia populo, subtilitates quaestionum scholasticae disputationi relinquens. See the already cited life, c. viii, § 48. Mens. Mart. t. i, f. 674.

[1] See the accounts in Wadding's Annalen des Franciskanerordens, t. iv, at the year 1272; and in the Chronicle of the Swiss Johann von Wintherthur. The latter writes concerning him, under the year 1340: Hic ab hominibus adhuc praesenti tempore extantibus, qui saepe suis sermonibus interfuerant, mihi et aliis hoc narrantibus, asseritur, habuisse spiritum prophetiae, nam multa et diversa praedixerat, quae nostris sunt temporibus adimpleta. This chronicler states that Berthold, who preached in several other Swiss cities, constantly declined complying with the requests of the citizens of Wintherthur, that he would also come to them, because they refused to do away an impost which was oppressive to the poor. Vid. Joannis Vitodurani Chronicon, f. vi, et seqq., in the Thesaurus historiae Helveticae. Tiguri, 1735.

[2] Professor F. K. Grieshaber of Rastadt, has this year published German sermons of an unknown person belonging to the thirteenth century, which in language bear considerable resemblance to Berthold's, but in which the moral element is still more predominant. They are marked by a gentle and earnest spirit of sincerity, but want the depth of Berthold.

cup; and hold or dispose of his hands in a well-bred fashion. Behold! such virtue is a mockery in God's sight. For even a dog may be taught to hold up his fore-paws, and to demean himself with a becoming grace."[1] "Had not our Lady been virtuous," says he soon afterwards,[2] "the Holy Ghost would not have come upon her. Could I but be certain, in this earthly state, that I should never lose the kingdom of heaven, I would rather be a virtuous man upon earth, than a saint in heaven; for then I would become progressively holier from day to day and from year to year." He warns his hearers against supposing that a man, by possessing this or that particular virtue, though he may be destitute of the other principal ones, and live in the practice of great sins, is still sure of the kingdom of heaven." True, one man may possess this, and another that virtue, in a higher degree; but at the same time, all these virtues must be together; for no man can enter the kingdom of heaven if he has not possessed, and does not still possess, all these virtues. Flatter not yourselves on possessing one virtue, or two, or three, or many. Hast thou but a single vice, which is called a capital sin, that settles the question for thee (so wird deiner nimmer Rath)."[3] He gives prominence to purity of heart, as the main thing on which everything depends. "He who looks upon a woman," says he,[4] "and thinks he would gladly commit sin with her, has, in God's sight, already done the deed." Here, as frequently in his sermons, he interrupts himself with the exclamation: "What! brother Berthold! how many would then be lost!" To which he replies: "Well, suppose thou shouldst find, in thy cellar, a man that has broken open thy chest; though as yet he has purloined nothing from it; what wouldst thou take him to be? Surely, thou wouldst take him to be a thief, and send him to the gallows. Just so God holds thee to be an actual adulterer; for that thou art not so, is no fault of thine. Thou art far more, on thy part, God's thief."[5] He ever sets forth love as constituting the essence of the Christian temper. Love (die Minne) is one of the most exalted virtues the world ever won. And hence the Almighty God so dearly prizes love, that he has made it the chief ornament of the kingdom of heaven. It is the noble food with which Almighty God will feed us. And therefore should we, on the earth, possess the true love, that we may ever be fed with it in the kingdom of heaven; for there is love beyond love."[6] Having spoken of the fulfilling of the law as consisting in supreme love to God, and in loving our neighbors as ourselves, he says of him who fulfils this law: "I will venture a great word — he has everything that God himself has.[7] True love to God consists in this, that thou avoidest all mortal sins, through the regard thou hast to God, therefore sincerely, as if there were neither hell nor devil; and not so much through the fear of hell, as through the love thou hast to God."[8] "Love is like fire," says he;[9] "whatever is placed in the fire, becomes fire. So is it with love. All that can befall a man who possesses true love is itself converted into a love. Has he to encounter great toils? It becomes a pleasure of love to him. Has he great

[1] In the edition of Kling, p. 186, etc. [2] P. 188. [3] P. 140. [4] P. 93
[5] P. 94. [6] P. 247. [7] P. 4. [8] P. 178. [9] P. 156.

poverty? It is the same.[1] It seems to many people as if they loved God, while yet they love him not in the way he has bidden. It is a small thing to love God with something else, — with a paternoster, an alms, with a visit to a church, or with a bow towards the altar, or to a picture. Others, who can discourse largely of Christ's sufferings, of God's love and mercy, are wanting in true love.[2] Learn not even to be an enemy to thine enemies; for it is an eminent sign that one is a child of our heavenly Father, and a pupil of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a dwelling of the Holy Ghost, if he has learned of him to love his enemies, and to carry a gentle heart towards them that have done him ill, and to be peaceful with them that hate peace. What joy has the Holy Ghost over the heart where he finds such constant quiet within. Such sweetness, however, is now rare on the earth; for such meekness we find not in all the world; seldom even with the clergy." In pointing out the distinction between true and false humility, he says: "We may be humble in apparel, in behavior, in gestures, in words; all this, without possessing humility of heart; as the case is with dissemblers. But the internal humility of the heart cannot remain concealed. It shows itself outwardly in everything; since it cannot appear otherwise than it is. Where it does not appear, there it does not exist in strength." True humility, he said, might be known by this, that they who possess it are willing to hear the same judgment passed upon them which they pass upon themselves. They are willing to be considered as nothing; to be thought sinners; and whatsoever good may be in them, to have God praised for it, from whom it has all proceeded. "It is better," says he,[3] "to devour half an ox on Good Friday, than to bewray a soul by falsehood."[4]

The deep-felt religious need, in connection with the complete formation of the vernacular tongues, had for its result that, in Germany, and in South France, in the Provençal language, various attempts were made to translate the Bible. The effect which, in all times, has accompanied the diffusion of the Scriptures among the people, was observed also in the present case; and it is easy to see how much might have been done for the religious awakening and enlightenment of the people, if such efforts, growing out of the national life and the religious need, had been taken advantage of by the church authorities. The word of God was received with great eagerness by the laity; and from it proceeded a mighty influence on the minds of men. Although the spread of translations of the Bible in the vernacular tongue was certainly not opposed, as yet, by any law; yet the whole church spirit and the existing relations between priests and laity, could not possibly be inclined to favor the more general circulation of such versions. By the universal use of the Bible, the religious consciousness of the laity would have been withdrawn from its dependence on the tutelage of the church and of the priesthood; and the way would necessarily be prepared thereby for a new evolution. A struggle could not fail to arise,

[1] P. 149. [2] P. 106. [3] P. 89. the quaint simplicity in which they appear in the old German.—Tr.]
[It is impossible to give these sayings

therefore, between the church system and the universal reading of the Scriptures; and even though the persons of highest station in the government of the church by no means entertained at first any intention of limiting the reading of the Scriptures by the laity; yet they would be actually driven to this course, by the interest and logical coherence of the system which they wished to maintain. In addition to this, it was especially by means of the sects who stood forth in opposition to the dominant church system, that the Bible was once more spread among the laity, whence, with the diligent reading of it, was connected, from the first, a tendency unfavorable to the hierarchy. It is remarkable that pope Innocent the Third was originally inclined rather to encourage than to suppress the reading of the Bible by the laity, till, influenced by the principles of the church theocracy, of which he was the representative, he was led, by the consequences growing out of that tendency, to contend against it.

By Waldenses, who came from Montpellier,[1] translations of the Psalter, of Job, of the epistles of St. Paul, and of several other books of the Bible, in the Provençal language, were spread in the diocese of Metz, and they were eagerly caught up and read, by men and women. The light of a religious knowledge, to which their ignorant clergy would have been unable to lead them, here rose upon them. Societies were formed, of men and women, who read the Bible to one another, and were edified thereby: but, as was reported to pope Innocent the Third,[2] a certain spiritual pride infected the members of these associations, insomuch that they believed themselves to be the only true Christians, and felt inclined to despise all who took no part in their assemblies. It is, however, quite possible, also, that this charge was brought against them by their adversaries, simply because they maintained, as they might rightly do, that they had a better knowledge of the essence of Christianity than others; and, by their manner of life, ordered according to the doctrine of the Bible, distinguished themselves from the multitude. The priests and parish clergy, it is true, could as yet detect nothing that savored of heresy in these people; but still they could not be pleased with their effort to make themselves independent of them; and they endeavored to put a stop to these private meetings. The members of them then met the priests with arguments from the Bible, to show they needed not allow themselves to be forbidden these private means of edification. And several of them assured the ignorant clergy that, in their books, they had what was better than anything they could give them. The bishop of Metz drew up a report of these movements, within his community, for the pope; but the latter was far from wishing to suppress the whole thing, at once, by violent measures. He had undoubtedly learned, from the experience of his predecessors,[3] how easily such efforts, capable, without doubt, of being made to work in harmony with the church life,

[1] See Caesarius of Heisterbach, Distinct. v, c. xx, f. 138.

[2] Lib. ii, ep. 141: Qui etiam aspernantur eorum consortium, qui se similibus non immiscent, et a se reputant alienos qui aures et animos talibus non apponunt.

[3] See further on.

and under the supervision of the general church guidance, of proving eminently beneficial, might, by the ecclesiastical despotism which would check every freer movement of the religious spirit, be pushed to an heretical opposition. This pope was well aware, too, that the study of the Bible was better suited, than anything else, to beget and foster a spiritual bent of piety; he recognized the Bible as furnishing the best means of nourishment for the soul, and the surest remedy for all the disorders of the soul; only he supposed that but few could elevate themselves to this lofty stage; that the majority must content themselves with that union to Christ which came through the medium of sensible things; such, for instance, as the holy eucharist, a medium instituted, indeed, by Christ himself, for the use of all.[1] He might, therefore, be rather surprised and rejoiced, than otherwise, to learn that the Bible had, in spite of his doubts, found its way among the laity; and that they derived from it nourishment for their piety; provided nothing was connected therewith which appeared to him fanatical or calculated to disturb the order of the church. He therefore issued to the bishop and chapter of the cathedral at Metz, a letter, to the following import.[2] "While it is the duty of prelates to keep a careful watch that the heretics may not succeed in laying waste the Lord's heritage, they should also be extremely cautious how they attempt to gather up the tares before the time of the harvest, lest, perchance, the good fruit may be plucked away also. While no tolerance should be shown to heresy, it was important, also, that no harm should be done to a pious simplicity, lest the simple might be converted into heretics."[3] He called upon them to admonish these people, and persuade them with arguments, that they should abstain from everything that deserved censure, and not intrude into matters foreign from their calling. And he required, also, before he proceeded to any further decision on the matter, a more exact report from them, based on careful inquiry, as to the questions, who was the author of the translation referred to; by what motives he was led to prepare it; what was the character of the faith of those who used this translation; what had led them to set up themselves as teachers. The pope, by his own conduct, set an example to those who were placed over the communities, teaching them how they ought to proceed with such people; how they ought to place themselves in their point of view, and use

[1] We gather this from the words of Innocent. in the fourth book of his work, De mysteriis missae, c. xliv, t. i, f. 395. After having mentioned the words at the institution of the sacrament, he says: Non enim solam scripturarum commemorationem ad hoc sufficere judicabat, qui lethargicum venerat aegrotum sanare. Quota namque pars nostri capit illud, quod in evangelio optimis unguentis fragrat, antidotum, verbum quod erat in principio apud Deum, per quem omnia facta sunt quodque caro factum est habitavit in nobis? Nam illud quidem ruminare, medela salubris est, super mel et favum, dulcis faucibus animae diligentis. Sed tamen *cibus valde paucorum* est et solius mentis pabulum; quo tunc anima plenissime satiabitur, cum verbum ipsum in aeterna felicitate gustabit. On the other hand, concerning the institution of the Lord's supper, he says: Quibus lethargicam mentem aegroti renovata quotidie suae salutis commemoratione percelleret et edentulam, id est sine dentibus plebem, quae verbum antiquum et aeternum principium quasi solidum cibum ruminare non poterat, hoc dulcissimo confecto liquamine in panis et vini sacramento consuefaceret sorbillare.

[2] Lib. ii, ep. 142.

[3] Ne in haereticos de simplicibus commutentur.

passages from the Holy Scriptures themselves, for the purpose of opening their eyes to what was censurable in their conduct, and of leading them away from it.[1] A letter, which he himself wrote to these people, was to serve as a pattern for the clergy.[2] After having explained to them, in detail, what had been reported of them, he declared: "Although the desire of learning how to understand the Holy Scriptures, and of using them for mutual edification, was not to be found fault with, but rather deserved commendation; yet it was a thing not to be approved of, that they should hold their meetings in private; that they should take upon themselves the office of preaching; ridicule the simplicity of the priests, and avoid the society of those who would take no part in their meetings; for that God, who is the true light, that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, so abhors the works of darkness, that he gave express command to the apostles, when he sent them forth to preach the gospel to all the world: 'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops,' Matt. 10: 27, whereby he manifestly gives it to be understood that the gospel should be preached, not in secret conventicles, as it is by the heretics, but after the Catholic manner, publicly in the churches." He then, seemingly without design, as though he had no particular reference to them, proceeded to say, "that a special preparatory training was requisite in order to penetrate into the deep things of the sacred Scriptures. For this reason, a particular order had been instituted in the church; and since this had been done, it was not for every one, indiscriminately, to arrogate to himself the office of teacher, but it depended on the fact, whether a man was entrusted with it by the Lord. Should it be affirmed, however, by any one, that God had commissioned him to undertake such a calling in some invisible way, and that such an immediate divine call was superior to any human call, to this person it should be replied: 'As this is a hidden thing, it is not sufficient barely to affirm it, which indeed any false teacher might do concerning himself, but he must prove it, either by a miracle, or by some express testimony of Holy Scripture.' No doubt," he says again, "knowledge is preëminently necessary for priests, in order that they may be enabled rightly to discharge the office of teachers; yet the more learned ought not to undervalue the less highly educated priests, but always honor in them the priestly vocation." He warned them, moreover, against the pharisaical pride which they would inevitably betray, if they looked upon themselves as alone correct, and despised all who did not join their party. Finally, he threatened them with the severity of the church, if they would not listen to his paternal admonitions. The reading of the Scriptures, however, had already led these truth-seeking laymen to the knowledge of many errors in the church doctrines. They continued to hold their meetings, in spite of the episcopal prohibition; they refused to give up their translation of the Bible; they declared

[1] As he himself says: Revocandi et convincendi secundum scripturas super his, quae reprehensibilia denotavimus. [2] Ep. 141.

they would not obey the pope himself, if he should undertake to suppress it. Already several among them avowed, more or less openly, that it was right to obey God rather than men. When this was reported to the pope, by the bishop of Metz, he believed it to be now necessary for him to act with more severity. Still, however, he was unwilling to proceed at once to extreme measures, but preferred, in the first place, to obtain more exact information of the case, and to try milder remedies. Thinking, perhaps, that he could not place entire confidence in the bishop, he commissioned the abbot of Cistercium and three other abbots, in conjunction with the bishop, to investigate the affair, and to examine those people who were to be brought up for trial; a report of all which was to be drawn up and laid before the pope.[1] As the result of this examination, it was found that those separatists professed doctrines which, considered from the position of the church-system, could not appear otherwise than as heresies. A connection was found to exist between them and the sect of the Waldenses, who had long before incurred the condemning sentence of the church. Their assemblies were broken up, and their Bibles committed to the flames. Thus the contest for the dominant church-system, with the sects that fought against it, led to the forcible suppression of the reading of the Bible among the laity; although no such result was intended at the beginning. A synod at Toulouse, in the year 1229, issued a prohibition of this sort, directed against the translation of the Bible into the spoken language, and the reading of any such translation by laymen.[2]

Although religious feeling predominated beyond any other spiritual power in these times, and the supernaturalistic element had diffused itself through the whole spiritual atmosphere, yet even in this period of a predominating religious tendency, the reactions, which have their ground in the essence of the natural man, and are directed against the principle of faith and the recognition of the supernatural generally, could not be wholly wanting. Even in this period, we observe many indications of this reaction that runs through the entire history of humanity; partly in a distinctly avowed infidelity, and partly in transitory agitations coming up in the form of temptations, and overcome by the power of a triumphant faith. This reaction proceeded from different points; sometimes it was from that tendency of rude sensuousness which, elsewhere restrained by the superior might of the religious principle, is wont, when it intermingles with the religious feeling itself, to beget superstition; and then, rebelling against this, its antagonist force, leads to the infidelity of brutal natures; at others, it was the worldly culture which began to flourish from the times of the twelfth century, and particularly the speculative bent which set itself in hostility against the faith. Added to this, were those influences from

[1] Lib. ii, ep. 235.

[2] C. xiv: Prohibemus, ne libros veteris testamenti aut novi laïci permittantur habere, nisi forte psalterium vel breviarium pro divinis officiis aut horas beatae Mariae aliquis ex devotione habere velit. Sed ne praemissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos, arctissime inhibemus.

without, which tended to call forth or to promote such reactions — the influence of the Arabian philosophy from Spain; and of intercourse with the Jews, now widely dispersed among the Christian nations. The emperor Frederic the Second, and king John Sansterre of England, are to be considered in this regard, not merely as solitary appearances, but as the signs of such tendencies that presented a hostile aspect to the religious principle of the times; tendencies which recur also under other forms. Thus we find, at the end of the eleventh century, a certain count John of Soissons, who attacked, with rude insolence, the power of the clergy; favored Jews and heretics; borrowed weapons from the Jews to combat the doctrines of the Christian faith, which he joined with them in ridiculing; and yet, whether it resulted from hypocrisy and a respect for outward considerations, or from the momentary influence of that religious feeling which was so exceedingly dominant in the spirit of the age, attended church and took part in the acts of worship. "On the Christmas and Easter festivals," says the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, "he made his appearance at church with such humility, that one could scarcely look upon him as an unbeliever. And yet he did not hesitate to declare everything that was preached concerning Christ's passion and resurrection, a mere farce."[1] The abbot Guibert, who had a great deal to suffer from this individual, expresses his surprise that a man who called himself a Christian; and who sometimes, though in a mean and stealthy way, visited the churches; sometimes manifested respect to the altars and priests; participated in the communion of the faithful and in confession; adored the crucifix, and sometimes even brought himself to give an alms; — that such a person should utter blasphemies which the very Jews themselves dared not openly express. A Jewess, with whom the abbot Guibert once spoke concerning him, called it pure insanity, that he should first prostrate himself before an image of the Saviour, and then go away and blaspheme him.[2] This abbot composed a book in defence of the doctrine of the incarnation of the deity, in answer to objections borrowed from the Jews and circulated abroad by the above-mentioned count. — The pious bishop Moritz of Paris, well known as a benefactor of the poor and of orphans, desired at his death, which happened in 1196, to testify his faith in a future resurrection, and by his example, to confirm in their faith many educated persons, of whom he had been told that they doubted concerning this doctrine.[3] For this reason he left it in charge to his friends, that when his body was exposed to the public view, a card should be laid on his breast, containing the words: "I believe that my Redeemer liveth; and that on the last day I shall arise, and, in my body, behold my Saviour. This testimony of my hope has been laid upon my breast."[4] This was designed for the learned, who should meet together on the day of his

[1] De vita sua, lib. iii, c. xv.

[2] Tractat. de incarnatione contra Judaeos, c. i.

[3] Quia resurrectionem corporum, de qua multos peritos tempore suo haesitantes audierat, firmissime credebat, cupiens illos ab incredulitate sua etiam moriens revocare. — Rigord. de gestis Philippi, at this year, p. 40.

[4] Credo, quod redemptor meus vivit et

burial. Among the internal conflicts of the faithful, mention is also made of conflicts with the skepticism of the understanding. We have already cited several examples of this kind, in the history of monasticism. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, a young man of a quick and active mind, named Rainer, who had entered the Dominican order, while diligently busying himself, in his monastery at Bruges, in the study of the scholastic theology, and comparing the arguments which might be alleged for and against Christianity, was assailed by a host of doubts. He conversed with Jews, for the purpose of ascertaining what they could say, at the position which they occupied; and his doubts grew stronger than ever. His superiors, on observing this, kept him from frequenting the society in which he found nourishment for his doubts. But the forbidden intercourse only became so much the more attractive; the fire which his friends sought to smother burst forth with more violence;[1] and, at midnight, he fled from the monastery.[2] He afterwards vanquished his doubts, and became still firmer in his faith than ever. That sincerely pious monarch, Louis the Ninth, was no stranger to such assaults of temptation. He exhorted all[3] to struggle against them betimes; to attain to steadfastness of faith, in order to be prepared against the final hour, when Satan tries his best to entangle men in skepticism. "We should not rest satisfied," said he, "until we can say to the devil, Away, thou enemy of human nature; thou shalt not be able to deprive me of my settled faith; rather would I consent to part with every limb of my body, than to renounce this faith, in which I intend to live and to die. He who does this," he adds, "will foil the enemy at his own weapons."[4] It was therefore the opinion of the pious monarch, — an opinion which he shared also with the men of these times, rich in Christian experience with regard to all tempting thoughts, — that no admission should be allowed to such thoughts, when they arose involuntarily; but the soul should surrender itself more entirely to the faith, and, in the assurance of this, despise them. To confirm this advice, the king quoted a saying which he had heard from the lips of one of the distinguished theologians of this period, bishop William of Paris (or of Auvergne). A respectable teacher of theology once came to him in quest of spiritual counsel. But before he could state his case, he fell into a violent fit of weeping. The bishop then bespoke him in words of comfort, and said: 'Despair not; for no man can be so great a sinner as to exceed God's ability to forgive him his sins. Whereupon, the man laid open his doubts

in novissimo die de terra resurrecturus sum et in carne mea videbo salvatorem meum, quem visurus sum ego et non alius et oculi mei conspecturi sunt. Reposita est haec spes mea in sinu meo.

[1] The Dominican and suffragan bishop of Cambray, Thomas de Cantiprat, who relates this in his Bonum universale, or his book De apibus, l. ii, c. x, says in this connection: quoniam arctatus ignis acrior consurgit.

[2] According to the report of Thomas Cantiprat, he was quieted by a vision of the virgin Mary, and induced to return back to his monastery. Some occurrence of a psychological nature may, perhaps, lie at the bottom of this story, but what it was it is impossible to make out from the isolated facts reported to us.

[3] See Joinville, l. c. p. 177.

[4] Qui ainsi le fait, il vainqt l'ennemy du baton, dont l'ennemy le vouloit occire.

respecting the doctrine of the eucharist, which he considered a temptation of Satan. The bishop asked him whether he found pleasure in these doubts? And when the man who was troubled with them assured him that his faith was more precious to him than all the wealth in the world, and that he would rather suffer one limb after another to be severed from his living body than to deny the least article in it,— the bishop proposed to him the following question: "Suppose our king to be at war with the king of England, and that he had intrusted to each of us two the defence of a citadel; to you, one situated on the frontier, and exposed to the greatest danger; to me, one in the centre of the country,— to which of us would he feel the most thankful?" And the theologian, being obliged to reply, "To the former,"— the bishop resumed: "My mind, disturbed by no doubts, is to be compared with that second citadel; yours, which amid so many conflicts remains true to the faith, is like the first. Surely, then, your condition is of greater account in the eye of God than mine; only trust in him, and be assured that, wherever it is needful, he will help you."

There was a dead faith of the worldly heart, which had adopted a form, to the power of which it was a stranger, as a mere matter of tradition; and which was preserved free from all doubts, simply by reason of its indifference to all the objects of faith. To persons of this stamp, it could hardly fail to happen, that, with an awakening interest in these objects, doubts also would start into being; and these doubts might sometimes prove a necessary point of transition to true faith. A tendency of this sort is described by that profound observer of the secret workings of the soul, Hugo a Sancto Victore, where he is describing a class of men,[1] whose faith consisted in nothing else than merely taking care not to contradict the faith; men who were called believers, rather from the custom of a life passing under the outward guise of Christianity, than from any power of faith:[2] "for with their eyes ever fixed on the perishable, they never elevate their souls to that degree as to think on futurity; and though they unite with other believers, in partaking of the sacraments of the Christian faith; still, they never ask themselves why a man is a Christian, or what is the hope of future good among Christian men. Although such persons pass under the name of believers, yet, in reality and truth, they are at a great distance from faith,"[3] or, as he remarks in another place:[4] "Men who live as they have been born, would, had they been born elsewhere, be no believers at all."[5] And with such, he believed it a sign of the first visitation of divine grace, when they were aroused to consider for what man was born; whether another life followed the present; and whether there were rewards for the good and punishments for the wicked. Thus, it was only the

[1] De sacramentis fidei, p. x, lib. i, c. iv, Ed. Venet. 1588, t, ii, f. 257.

[2] Quibus credere est solum fidei non contradicere, qui consuetudine vivendi magis quam virtute credendi fideles nominantur.

[3] Re et veritate longe sunt a fide.

[4] Miscellan. lib. i, tit. xviii, f. 47.

[5] Qui ita vivunt, ut nati sunt, qui si in alio nati essent, fideles non essent.

doubts that filled their consciences with alarm, when they contemplated the uncertainty of human life, that awakened in them, according to Hugo, the longing after the knowledge of the truth. The abbot Peter of Cluny heard that a great number — as he had reason to suspect, of the monks around him — had expressed doubts whether Christ had anywhere in the gospels called himself God. They had, therefore, carefully examined them, and could arrive at no satisfactory conclusion. The abbot Peter did not ask after their names; nor did he allow himself to draw any hasty inferences from the doubts which they expressed. He took it for granted they had not fallen away from their faith, but were only inquiring after the truth, and seeking instruction. Lest, however, this suspense and hesitation should lead to skepticism with regard to the doctrine itself,— of Christ's divinity,— he composed a tract, the object of which was to prove that Christ bore witness to his own divinity, by the manner in which he spoke of himself.

The religious feelings of the multitude, lively in their character, but quite exposed to be alloyed by a rude sensuousness, easily betrayed them into fanatical extravagances; and although, as we have seen, voices of commanding influence were not wanting to guide to the spiritual apprehension of divine things,— and to warn against every thing fanatical and superstitious,— yet, the men of this spirit were too few to exert a sufficient degree of influence on the masses; and the greater number of incompetent or badly disposed ecclesiastics and monks, contributed by their influence to promote the evils which they ought to have averted. Hence, the wide and rapid spread of so many excrescent growths of fanaticism and superstition,— one case of which we have in saint-worship. Men who, by their lives, by their deeds and words, had made a powerful impression on the religious feelings of the people, were easily made the objects of an extravagant veneration; and it was necessary for them to be at every pains to put a check to it, lest it might reach the point of idolatry. At the tomb of some such individual, vast numbers would soon be found assembled for the purpose of prayer; the heightened devotion, the excited state of the imagination, were capable of producing remarkable effects on soul and body; exaggerating report magnified the facts, and thus stories of the miraculous cures that had been performed at such tombs, spread far and wide; and an ever-increasing multitude of people, moved by devotion, curiosity, or the hope of succor, were attracted to the spot. While some, carried away by this general enthusiasm for the memory of the departed saint, gave countenance to such movements among the people, many sensible bishops and abbots thought it necessary to adopt precautionary measures, lest fanaticism or fraud should take advantage of these tumultuous exhibitions of religious feeling; in doing which, however, they were always liable to injure the reputation of their piety.[1] The attempt forcibly to suppress such exhibitions by outward

[1] After the death of the abbot Walter of Melrose, in Scotland (A. D. 1160), his successor, William, published an order forbidding the sick to flock to his tomb; but he exposed himself thereby to the reproach of envy or of arrogance; as if he had presumed to set limits to the divine grace. The author of the life of the former ab-

measures, instead of accomplishing its object, was apt to lead to exactly the contrary result. Many tombs became celebrated for the miraculous cures which were performed at them, through reports, the foundation of which could never be ascertained; and thus many a dead man, probably, attained to the honor of a saint who was far from deserving it. Ignorance, credulity, and fraud would contribute, in some degree, to multiply the number of saints. When Lanfranc was created archbishop of Canterbury, he was surprised to find that many were honored as saints, in England, respecting whom no reason could be given why they deserved that honor. To the number of these belonged, in particular, Elfeg, archbishop of Canterbury, slain by the Normans, in 1012, who was worshipped as a saint and a martyr. Lanfranc did not think he ought to be regarded as a martyr,— for he had not died in confessing the Christian faith,— but had been slain when a prisoner among the Normans, simply because he refused to pay the sum demanded for his ransom. Having stated the case to Anselm, while the latter was on a visit to him in England, Anselm endeavored to show that the aforesaid archbishop deserved beyond question to be regarded as a martyr; "for," said he, "a man, who chooses rather to die than to dishonor God by the slightest sin, would surely hesitate still less to sacrifice his life rather than provoke the divine displeasure by a more grievous transgression. And so that archbishop Elfeg, who chose rather to die than to redeem his life at the expense of his community, would assuredly not have shrunk from death if he had been commanded to deny Christ. And besides, what else was meant by dying for justice or for truth, than dying for Christ, who is justice and truth?"[1] Anselm himself was afterwards obliged, however, to declare against a saint-worship of this sort, for which no due reasons were assigned.[2] How easily the reputation of a saint might be acquired among the people, appears from an example cited by the abbot Guibert. It was quite sufficient for this purpose, among the country-people of France, that the squire of a knight should have died on Good Friday. The peasants of the district, eager after novelties, brought gifts and wax-tapers to his tomb; a house was erected over it, and country-pilgrims flocked to it from afar. Wonderful stories were spread abroad, and mixed with the rest was a plentiful share of imposture. Avarice, taking advantage of the credulity of the people, led people first to feign themselves sick, and then to be healed by the pretended saint.[3] The abbot of the monastery within whose territory was the spot where these things transpired, was forgetful enough of

bot observes: Videtur pluribus hujusmodi prohibitionem praesumptuosam nimis esse, ut homo luteo tabernaculo circumdatus misericordiae fontem audeat obstruere, et gloria coelesti clarificatum mundoque miraculis manifestatum sub cespite silentii praesumat obruere. Mens. August, t. i, f. 274.

[1] See the life of Lanfranc, by his disciple, Milo-Crispin, in the Actis Sanctorum Ord. Benedicti of Mabillon, § 37, saec. vi p. ii, f. 654

[2] He threatened an abbess, who favored such worship, with suspension. See his letter, l. iv, ep. 10.

[3] The abbot Guibert, De pignoribus sanctorum, lib. i, c. ii, § 5: In profani vulgi avaris pectoribus capi potuerunt fictitiae surditates, affectatae vesaniae, digiti studio reciprocati ad volam, vestigia contorta sub clunibus.

his duty to connive at these impostures for the sake of the gain.[1] Unprincipled monks pushed a lucrative trade with fictitious relics, in extolling the virtues of which they spared no lies.[2] Processions with relics were got up with a view to collect money for the rebuilding of a church; and the clergy, who cried up, in mountebank-fashion, their various virtues, pretended, without blushing, to show in a casket the bread which our Lord himself had touched with his teeth. Every village was anxious to have its own guardian saints. Thus false legends of saints sprang up among the people. The clergy tolerated this; and so these legends, passing from mouth to mouth, continually gained credence; and among the populace, whoever presumed to lisp a syllable against them, was accounted an enemy of piety, and provoked against himself the popular fury.[3] In opposition to these abuses of the worship of saints and relics, the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, wrote his work, *De Pignoribus Sanctorum*, in four books. He called it a grievous sin that men should think of glorifying God by falsehoods. He accused those who spread abroad stories of miracles, of making God a liar.[4] He detected one source of the abuse, in what he considered the unnatural practice of removing the bodies of holy men from the earth in which they reposed, and of distributing and carrying about their separated members in costly settings.[5] He declared it unbeseeming that the body of the disciple should be honored above that of the Master; that while Christ was buried beneath the stone, the members of his disciples should be denied the earth from which they originally came, to be preserved in gold, silver, precious stones, and silks.[6] He protested especially against the carrying about the so-called relics of the body of Christ. It was only by spiritual communion that men should now rise upward to Christ. Christ communicated himself under the figure of the bread and wine in the supper, in order that the faithful might have their minds withdrawn from the things of sense. He refers to Christ's words addressed to his disciples (John 16: 7), that the Holy Ghost would not come to them till he was no longer sensibly present before their eyes. "Those who pretend to show such relics," says he, "contradict this word of truth. For what does Christ say? The Holy Spirit will not come if his own bodily presence be not first withdrawn from men; because, unless the sight of everything bodily be withdrawn, the soul will not rise to the faith of contemplation. For the exercise and trial of our faith, our Lord would lead us away from his proper to his

[1] As Guibert says: Munerum comportatorum blandiente frequentia infecta miracula fieri supportabat.

[2] The work above cited, l. c. § 6.

[3] Guibert, lib i, c. iii, § 1. After having spoken of the ancient, approved saints, he adds: Cum enim alii alios summos conspicerent habere patronos, voluerunt et ipsi quales potuerunt facere suos. Tacente clero anus et mulierecularum vilium greges talium patronorum commentatas historias post insubulos et litiatoria cantitant, et si quis earum dicta refellat, pro defensione ipsorum non modo convitiis, sed telorum radiis instant.

[4] Lib. i, c. ii, § 5: Qui Deo quod nequidem cogitavit adscribit, quantum, in se est, Deum mentiri cogit.

[5] Cap. iv, § 1: Certe si sanctorum corpora sua juxta naturae debitum loca, i. e. sepulchra servassent, hujusmodi errores vacassent.

[6] Ut discipulus praeponatur magistro? Ille lapidi intrudatur, hic auro claudatur? Ille nec plene sindone subtili involvatur, hic palliis aut sericis aurove textili succingatur?

mystical body; and thus should we progressively mount upward to the spiritual contemplation of the divine essence."[1]

Particularly did that tendency of devotion which manifested itself in paying honors to the Virgin Mary, in whom men adored the mother of our Saviour, and the ideal of the virgin-life, rise continually to a higher pitch, and lead onward to wilder extravagances. For a long time, already, the opinion had gained currency that she ought to be excepted from the number of human beings under the taint of corruption; that by a special operation of grace she had been preserved immaculate from all sin. But now, many were led, on the same principle, to take still another step, and to maintain that the Virgin Mary came into the world wholly free from original sin. Therefore, many began already to set apart for this glorification of the Virgin Mary, a particular festival,— the festival of the Immaculate Conception. But voices of influence and authority protested against such an innovation, and the dogma lying at the bottom of it. Canonicals of the church at Lyons having introduced such a festival, Bernard of Clairvaux declared himself decidedly opposed to it.[2] "On the same principle," he wrote to them, "you would be obliged to hold that the conception of her ancestors, in an ascending line, was also a holy one; since otherwise, she could not have descended from them after a worthy manner, — and there would be festivals without number.[3] But such a frequent celebration of festivals was appropriate only to our final home in heaven; it was unsuitable to a life, far from our true home, like this upon the earth. We ought not to attribute to Mary that which belongs to one Being alone, — to him who can make all holy,— and being himself free from sin, purify others from it. Besides him, all who have descended from Adam must say of themselves that which one of them says in the name of all (Psalm 51 : 5): 'In sin did my mother conceive me.'" The controversy concerning the festival of the Immaculate Conception, and the dogma therewith connected, spread also through England and Germany. It was the monks who contended for it; but there were monks also who combated it. Potho, a monk and priest in the monastery of Prüm in the province of Triers, who wrote, after the middle of the twelfth century, a work "On the condition of the house of God,"[4] combated, among many other innovations introduced by monks, this festival as the most absurd of all.[5] In evidence of the continued controversy on this subject, we have the letters relating to it which passed in the latter times of the twelfth century, between the abbot de la Celle, afterwards bishop of Chartres, and Nicholas, an English monk. The former maintained, as

[1] Lib. ii, c. vi, § 4: Nisi, quicquid corporeum ipsius est, a memoria abrogetur, ad contemplandi animus fidem nullatenus sublevatur. Ad exercitationem fidei nostrae, a principali corpore ad mysticum Dominus noster nos voluit traducere, et exinde quasi quibusdam gradibus ad divinae subtilitatis intelligentiam erudire.

[2] Ep. 173.

[3] De avis et proavis id ipsum posset pro simili causa quilibet flagitare et sic tenderetur in infinitum et festorum non esset numerus.

[4] In the Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxi.

[5] Quod magis absurdum videtur, at the end of the third book.

Bernard had done, that Mary was born with the tinder, the inflammable material, of sin,—lust, warring against reason; but that she was preserved, through the power of grace, from all the excitements of temptation, till at length, after the birth of Christ, she attained to a perfect exemption from the same.[1] He inveighed against the chimeras of the English.[2] But the monk Nicholas looked upon that which the abbot de la Celle had said concerning the conflict which lasted in Mary until the conception, as a disparagement of her dignity, and felt himself bound to stand forth in its defence. Although he honored Bernard as a saint, yet he believed that even he, like other holy men, might err on such a single point. He appealed, in proof of this, to the legend concerning an appearance of Bernard after his death.[3] Such visions, often susceptible of a very easy explanation, were, as it seems, at this period sometimes resorted to as a divine testimony to the truth: and Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominicans, in his work above cited,[4] denounces those who, instead of adducing texts of Scripture and passages from the fathers, appealed to uncertain dreams and visions for the purpose of defending innovations, to whom he applied the saying of the prophet Hosea (chapter xiii).[5] In like manner, Peter de la Celle declared, in this particular case: "I believe, respecting her, the gospel, and not dreams; and if I am in any way wrong, God will reveal this also, in the time and way he pleases."[6] The monk Nicholas appealed, moreover, to the fact of a progressive development of the church, which may even introduce innovations for the necessities of devotion.[7] But the abbot de la Celle maintained that any such new institution should proceed regularly from the church of Rome and a general council. He protested against the innovating caprice of individuals. This controversy was continued into the thirteenth century, and passed into the following periods. The antagonists of this extravagant veneration of Mary gained a very important voice on their side, when Thomas Aquinas stood forth as an opponent of that

[1] Lib. vi, ep. 23: Quod saeva libidinis incentiva Deo praeoperante nunquam senserit vel ad modicum. Caetera vero impedimenta humanae fragilitatis, quae naturali origine de natura procedunt, ante divinam conceptionem sentire potuit, sed nullatenus consensit. Praeveniente siquidem gratia fomes peccati anhelando supremum spiritum duxit, until this *fomes* was wholly destroyed through the operation of the Holy Spirit at the conception.

[2] Nec indignetur Anglia levitas, si ea solidior sit Gallica maturitas. Certe expertus sum, somniatores plus esse Anglicos quam Gallos.

[3] See his letter, l. ix, ep. 9: In Claravallensi collegio quidam conversus bene religiosus in visu noctis vidit Abbatem Bernardum niveis indutum vestibus quasi ad mamillam pectoris furvam habere maculam. And when he was asked, why?—he replied: Quia de Dominae nostrae conceptione scripsi non scribenda, signum purgationis meae maculam in pectore porto. The vision was committed to writing, and the document laid before the chapter-general, but it was burnt, maluitque Abbatum universitas virginis periclitari gloriam S. Bernardi opinione.

[4] De eruditione praedicatorum, lib. ii, in the section concerning councils.

[5] Alii sunt, qui innitentes quibusdam visionibus et somniis incertis intendunt propter illa aliquid ordinare, cum tamen sensus et intentio sanctorum ac tantorum virorum sint hujusmodi phantasiis omnino praeponenda.

[6] Lib. ix, ep. 10: Evangelio non somniis de illa credo, et si aliter sapio, et hoc ipsum revelabit Deus, quando voluerit et quomodo voluerit.

[7] Nonne eodem spiritu potantur moderni, quo et antiqui? Non erat ab initio nativitas virginis in ecclesia solennis, sed crescente fidelium devotione addita est praeclaris ecclesiae solennitatibus. Quare igitur non similiter et diem conceptionis obtineat sedulitas Christianae devotionis?

opinion, offering as an argument against it, that the honor due to Christ alone, would thereby suffer injury; inasmuch as he must be acknowledged to be the Saviour of all men; whom all needed, in order to be freed from original sin.[1] As he saw very clearly that nothing could be adduced from Holy Scripture concerning the conception and birth of Mary, he was of the opinion that no decision was to be arrived at here except on grounds of reason and analogy. From these then it might be argued that since on Mary, as the mother of Christ, was conferred greater favor than on any other human being, and since a Jeremiah, a John the Baptist, enjoyed the peculiar privilege of being sanctified from the womb, a like privilege must be attributed also to her. Hence, it might be, that although original sin existed in her, as a nature,[2] yet, through the grace imparted to her before her birth, and through the divine providence which accompanied her afterwards through her entire life, this inherited nature was so restrained, that no motion contrary to reason could proceed therefrom. Thus might that, which was potentially present in her, be, notwithstanding, always restrained from any actual putting forth, and thereupon, after the conception of Christ, might follow a perfect exemption, in her case, from all original sin, even in its potential being; which exemption was transferred to her from her Son, as the universal Redeemer.[3] This cautious reserve of the considerate Thomas Aquinas, a man who was in the habit of relying more on the declarations of Scripture than on human conjectures, was a quality of which Raymund Lull, with his bold flights of fancy and speculation, was altogether incapable. Among the necessary prerequisites, in order to Mary's becoming the organ for the incarnation of the Son of God, he reckoned this, that she should be exempt not only from all actual, but also from all original sin: for God and sin could not come together in the same subject.[4] The Holy Spirit had so wrought within her to prepare the way by her sanctification for the incarnation of the Son of God, as the sun by the dawn prepares the way for the day.[5]

As the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin grew out of that peculiar turn of devotion that originated in the monasteries, the same was the case likewise with another festival, which afterwards came to be very generally observed. It may easily be conceived that the mystical, contemplative bent of the monkish spirit, would first lead to the creation of a festival distinguished from other Christian festivals by the absence of all reference to historical facts; and such was that of the Trinity.[6] Yet if there was something in the Christian consciousness that resisted the introduction of a festival of the Immaculate

[1] Hoc derogaret dignitati Christi, secundum quam est universalis omnium Salvator.

[2] The fomes peccati.

[3] Credendum est, quod ex prole redundaverit in matrem totaliter fomite subtracto.

[4] Nisi beata virgo fuisset disposita, quod filius Dei de ipsa assumeret carnem, scilicet quod non esset corrupta nec in aliquo peccato sive actuali sive originali, filius Dei non potuisset ab ipsa assumere carnem, cum Deus et peccatum non possunt concordari in aliquo subjecto.

[5] Sic praeparavit viam incarnationis per sanctificationem, sicut sol diem per auroram. In lib. ii, sent. Quaest. 96, t. iv, opp., f. 84.

[6] The monk Potho of Prüm, near the end

Conception of Mary, there was, on the other hand, an appropriateness in a festival of the Trinity, constituting, as it were, a sort of terminus to the entire cycle of festivals in the year, which would recommend it to general acceptance, and gradually overcome the objections which might be raised on the ground of innovation. For it corresponded with the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to the sum total of Christian consciousness, that, as this doctrine has for its presupposition the full development of all that is contained in this consciousness, and the Christian consciousness of God arrives, therein, at a statement that exhausts the whole subject-matter; so a festival having reference to this doctrine would form the terminus of the cycle of festivals, commencing with Christ's nativity; and if this festival grew, in the first place, out of the significance which the doctrine of the Trinity had gained for the speculative and mystical theology of these times, yet this solemnity obtained a position, in the entire cycle of church festivals, which was calculated to direct attention to the original and essential significance of this doctrine.

As the customs and amusements usually connected with the pagan festivals of December and January had, in spite of every attempt to suppress them, still continued to be observed among Christians, both in the East and the West,[1] and had attached themselves to the celebration of the Christian festivals in these months — as, for example, to the festival of Christ's circumcision, which was directly opposed to the pagan celebration of January,[2] — so, in many districts, these customs gradually led to the practice of sportively travestying the offices and rites of the church, — a natural accompaniment of sensuous devotion, — as in the *festum fatuorum*, *follorum*, *hypodiaconorum*; abuses which, notwithstanding the various ordinances made in order to suppress them, continued afterwards to spread even more widely.[3]

We have, in the preceding periods, seen how it came to pass that the idea of the sacraments, understood at first so indefinitely as holy symbols, came to be restricted to a certain series of ecclesiastical transactions; and the practice of the church had already given sanction to the hypothesis, that these sacraments were all comprised under the sacred number *seven*. It only remained that various other holy signs, to which it had also been customary to apply the name of sacraments,[4] should be excluded, and the number seven more distinctly fixed. This was done in the present period, when the idea of the sacrament came to be more exactly and sharply defined by scientific theology. In the instructions given, by bishop Otto of Bamberg, to persons newly bap-

of the third book of his work De statu domus Dei, mentions the introducing of this festival also among the repentinis novitatibus in ecclesiasticis officiis, which innovations he traces to the juvenilis levitas, by which the vita monastica had allowed itself to be vitiated.

[1] Forbidden by the sixty-second canon of the second Trullan council, A. D. 691, directed against maskings and comical processions: *Μηδὲ να ἀνδρα γυναικειαν στολὴν ἐνδιδύσκεσθαι ἢ γυναῖκα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἁρμόδιον· ἀλλὰ μήτε προσωπεῖα κωμικὰ ἢ σατυρικὰ ἢ τραγικὰ ὑποδύεσθαι.*

[2] See vol. iii, p. 134.

[3] Whoever would like to know more on this subject, may consult Gieseler's Manual of Church History, vol. ii, sect. ii, p. 436, and ff. 2d ed.

[4] Thus we find the number twelve mentioned by Damiani. See vol. iii, p. 449.

tized, in the year 1124,[1] the determinate number of seven sacraments is mentioned for the first time. He wished to leave behind him, he said, for the new converts, from whom he was about to separate, these seven sacraments as the pledge, given by our Lord, of his fellowship with the church, in order that, amid the labors and conflicts of the present life, they might not faint and be discouraged.[2] The scientific theology of this century now sought to prove the internal necessity of this determinate number of the sacraments. It was customary to ascribe to them a twofold efficiency, — one positive, to prepare men for the whole duty of the Christian worship of God; the other negative, to meet and oppose the reactions of sin. At bottom lay the Christian idea, that the present earthly life should, in all its relations, be consecrated and sanctified by religion; and that the spiritual, in like manner with the bodily life, should have its own proper stages of development.[3] The peculiar form of the religious spirit, in these times, craved however, for everything, some medium of sensuous representation; and this was not to be a mere symbol, but must be objectively manifested, as the actual bearer of divine powers. Thus, in the first place, the birth to a spiritual life is represented by baptism; next, growth to maturity, by confirmation; finally, nutriment, in order to the preservation of the life and strength, by the Lord's supper. This would suffice, were not man subject, in his bodily and spiritual life, to manifold defects and disturbances. Diseases require their appropriate remedies. Answering to the recovery of health, is penance; to the promotion of reconvalescence, by means of appropriate diet and exercise, the extreme unction. Furthermore, as man belongs, both in a physical and spiritual sense, to some society; so the efficiency of the sacraments must extend, also, to this relation: thus ordination and marriage obtain their appropriate place. We have seen how the consciousness of a real communion with Christ in the Lord's supper assumed, in the all-absorbing supernaturalist element of this age, the form of a doctrine of transubstantiation; and how this notion, so firmly established in the whole mode of intuition peculiar to these centuries, could not fail to obtain the victory for it, over the modes of apprehension belonging to other habits and bents of mind. Accordingly, this doctrine was definitively settled for the church, at the Lateran council, in 1215.[4] The doctrine of transubstantiation being definitively settled, it must be followed by the determination that, after the miracle produced by the consecration, the "accidents" of bread and wine, without the subject, still remained; and a determination of this sort, though involving a contradiction in language, was still the best suited, at this particular point of view, to avoid such expressions of a gross and fleshly materialism as we saw employed by the zealots opposed to Berengar, as well as the fantastical, Docetic notion,

[1] See section i, p. 8.

[2] Septem sacramenta ecclesiae, quasi septem significativa dona Spiritus sancti, quibus intendendo in laboribus et certamine hujus vitae non deficere. Canisii lect. antiq., ed. Basnage, t. iii, p ii, f. 62. To be sure, the chronological date of the first mention of this number seven is uncertain; as we cannot vouch for the accuracy of the report.

[3] See, for example, the unfolding of this view by Thomas Aquinas.

[4] Transsubstantiatur panis in corpus Christi potestate divina.

that everything of a sensuous nature which took place at the Lord's supper, was only an appearance, without reality. In fact, the particular mode, after which the matter then presented itself to religious intuition, is, in this form, simply *objectized:* for this mode of religious intuition, everything sensible was purely an accident; the *essential* thing for it was, simply, the body of Christ, veiled under this figure. In this mode of intuition, the whole theocratico-ecclesiastical point of view, the whole mediæval form of apprehending Christianity was brought to a completion. The miracle of transubstantiation appeared as the ever-repeated miracle of all miracles, the act of the greatest self-humiliation of the deity.[1] It was the very Christ, who, under this sensible veil, presented himself to believing devotion; and the lively faith excited by the view of that Host, which was only the veil of Christ, might produce powerful effects.[2] Here was shown the high dignity of the Christian priesthood, that constantly served as the organ of this miracle of miracles, by means of which this utmost realization of the union of heaven and earth could be brought about, the very end and aim of all worship. But precisely for the reason that this dogma constituted the central and the highest point of the whole mode of intuition that governed the religious consciousness of these centuries, those who, in their modes of thinking, were opposed to the Catholic view, manifested a peculiar hostility to it, as we may perceive in the attacks against the church doctrines by the sects, and in the doubts and temptations with which ecclesiastics had to contend;[3] and contemplating such phenomena in their connection with the times, we may doubtless affirm that to many, who, with their religious life, belonged wholly to this standing-point of intuition, and who were incapable of apprehending Christianity in any other form, it was in fact a trial under which their faith in the supernatural must either be able to preserve itself, or else must succumb to that reaction of the mere understanding that discards everything supernatural. With others, it was, no doubt, the reaction of a freer and purer evangelical bent of the spirit; and this would, in the case of some, yield to the superior power of the dominant church spirit, while in others it proceeded to the point of an actual breach.

[1] As Raymund Lull, for example, in his glowing style of devotion, expresses it: Fuit unquam ullum mirabile vel ulla humilitas, quae cum ipso possit comparari, quod panis et vinum deveniant in tuam sanctam humanitatem, quae est unita cum deitate et quod tuum corpus adeo nobile se permittat manducari et tractari ab homine peccatore misero?

[2] This may be illustrated by the case of William, archbishop of Bourges, who, in the last struggles of death, seeing the Host approach, raised himself from his couch, and, filled with awe and enthusiastic faith, advanced with a firm and vigorous step to meet his Lord, and prostrated himself, with tears, before him. The incident is thus related in the language of the times: Ut autem Dominum creatorem suum ad se venisse cognovit, illico resumptis viribus, de strato prosiliens, tanquam febris omnis abscessisset, non sine stupore circumstantium, maxime quod jam fere in supremo spiritu positus videretur, et vix aliquid liquoris posset in os admittere, concito gradu procedit, vires certe subministrante caritate flexisque genibus, totus lacrimis diffluens, illum adorat. See the above-cited life, c. viii, § 29. Mens. Januar. t. i, f. 634.

[3] To the same cause may be referred, also, the doubts by which an ecclesiastic was annoyed, who complained of his distress to bishop William of Paris. See above, p. 326.

The latter may have been the case with that ecclesiastic of whom St. Bernard speaks, in his life of the archbishop Malachias of Armagh.[1] There was a certain man of good intellectual endowments, who refused to recognize in the eucharist the true body of Christ, but looked upon it as only a means of spiritual communion with Christ, whereby one is advanced in holiness.[2] The bishop, after having tried in vain by private conversations to convince him of his error, called together a meeting of the clergy, before which the denier of the doctrine of transubstantiation was summoned to appear. The matter was here discussed with him, and the judgment of all present went against him. He still persisted, however, in his opinion, affirming that he was not overcome by arguments, but put down by the authority of the bishop. Respect to the person of no man, he said, should prevail upon him to forsake the truth. It is then stated that, soon afterwards, falling into a mortal sickness, he was led to seek reconciliation with the church. The report which has come down to us respecting this matter is not, however, sufficiently exact to enable us to determine from it what were the actual facts. Abelard intimates that the question concerning the Lord's supper belonged, in his day, among those which were yet *sub lite*.[3] We learn from another report,[4] that there were still in the twelfth century many who condemned Berengar, without being at a very wide remove from his doctrines. They supposed that, by a metonomy, conformable to the biblical usage of language, — by which the name of a thing was transferred to what represented it,— the consecrated bread might be denominated the body of Christ; and they pronounced Berengar to be wrong only in that he had so openly expressed an opposite view to the common church representation, and thus given occasion of offence to many.[5] As the free spirit of inquiry, encouraged by the dialectic theology, called forth many antagonisms, so, among the rest, there seem to have been some who[6] appealed to the sayings of the old church-fathers, particularly of Augustin, in defence of a similar opinion to that of Berengar.[7] And that mystic himself, who with so much warmth and earnestness defended the faith in the true reality of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, still, — when he

[1] Cap. 26.

[2] Sacramentum et non rem sacramenti, id est solam sanctificationem et non corporis veritatem.

[3] Sed nec adhuc illam summam controversiam de sacramento altaris, utrum videlicet panis ille, qui videtur, figura tantum sit dominici corporis, an etiam veritas substantiae ipsius dominicae carnis, finem accepisse, certum est. Theol. Christian. l. iv. Martene et Durand. thesaur. anecdotor. t. v, f. 1315.

[4] That of Zacharias, bishop of Chrysopolis (Scutari), in his Commentary on the four gospels, l. iv, c. clvi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xix, f. 916.

[5] Sunt nonnulli, imo forsan multi, sed vix notari possunt (they cannot easily be noticed, because they conceal their real opinions), qui cum damnato Berengario idem sentiunt, et tamen eundem cum ecclesia damnant. In hoc videlicet damnant eum, quia formam verborum ecclesiae abjiciens, nuditate sermonis scandalum movebat. Non sequebatur, ut dicunt, usum scripturarum, quae passim res significantes tanquam significatas appellant.

[6] Rupert of Deutz, says of them: Quid dicemus magnis et magnificis parvulorum magistris, quibus interdum suavius redolet Platonis academia, quam haec vivifica Domini mensa? Commentar. in Joann. l. vi, t. ii, f. 308. Ed. Paris, 1638.

[7] He says of them: Ubi totius viribus intenti ad expugnandam veritatem dominici corporis et sanguinis magnorum sententias doctorum attulerint.

wished to say that the miracle here wrought by the Holy Ghost was one which remained hidden from the perception of the senses, and produced no alteration in the sensuous emblems,— was driven to make an assertion at variance with the doctrine of transubstantiation, namely, the following: that it was the manner of the Holy Ghost, not to destroy the nature of a thing, but to appropriate it as the bearer of higher powers,— not to remove the existing substance, but to raise it to a higher potence.[1] Were one to apply a principle of this sort with logical consistency to the doctrine in question, he would be carried back — as Rupert, using the same comparison, also observes — to the older hypothesis,[2] that the union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine was to be conceived as similar to the union of the two natures in Christ; and among the different views which at that time were still held forth respecting the doctrine of the Lord's supper, one of this sort actually made its appearance.[3] As the doctrine of transubstantiation had proceeded from the one-sided supernaturalist element which governed the minds of that period, so it operated back again also, in promoting and encouraging the same particular bent. Hence, the deification of outward symbols which now prevailed; these symbols being made,— even independent of the whole sacred rite, and of the end which it was designed to subserve,— objects of superstitious veneration; which, to be sure, was not first called forth by this article of doctrine, but had its foundation laid long before in that externalization of the religious feelings, which led to the supposition of a supernatural power adhering to the sensuous element. In order consistently to maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to give up nothing on the side of the objective, it was assumed, that so long as the emblems of the bread and wine — perceivable to the senses — were present; so long, — in the same manner as the *substance* of both was before contained under these emblems, — the *Body of Christ* was now present, veiled under the same;[4] and accordingly, it was necessary to infer that, if a mouse or a dog should nibble the consecrated host, the substance of Christ's body still did not, on that account, cease to be there. Thomas Aquinas was of the opinion that this by no means tended to lower the dignity of Christ's body; since, in fact, he had, without any lowering of his dignity, suffered himself to be crucified by sinners; especially, considering it was not the body of Christ, according to its proper essence, but only in respect to these outward emblems, under which it was veiled in the sacrament, that was thereby affected.[5]

[1] Spiritus sancti affectus non est, destruere vel corrumpere substantiam, quamcunque suos in usus assumit, sed substantiae bono permanenti quod erat, invisibiliter adjicere, quod non erat. Commentar. in Exod. l. ii, c. x, t. i, f. 171.

[2] See vol. ii, p. 671.

[3] Among these different opinions which the scholastic writer, Alger of Liege, cites in the preface to his book written in defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation: De sacramento corporis et sanguinis Dominici, we find also this: In pane Christum quasi imparatum, sicut Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum. Bibl. patr. Ludg. t. xxi, f. 251.

[4] Quod defertur corpus Christi, quousque species defertur.

[5] Nec hoc vergit in detrimentum dignitatis corporis Christi, qui voluit a peccatoribus crucifigi absque diminutione suae dignitatis, praesertim, cum mus aut canis non tangat ipsum corpus Christi secundum propriam speciem, sed solum secundum species sacramentales, — non sacramentaliter, sed per accidens corpus Christi manducat.

We see here the most extreme point of realistic externalization to which the interest to retain the objective side unimpaired could bear to be pushed. And that which was expounded by Thomas Aquinas with a refined and cautious species of dialectics, was expressed by others in a still crasser form; yet, the pious delicacy of many resisted a tendency which was driven, purely out of a dread of the subjective element, to a profanation of the holy essence; and voices of commanding influence, declared themselves opposed to such a conclusion. Among these we may place even the word of a pope, that of Innocent the Third, who, in his work De Mysteriis Missae, entered minutely into the examination of everything pertaining to this sacrament. And in fact, we recognize in this performance, the work of a man thoroughly fitted for the supreme guidance of the church, — of one, who distinguished himself by a certain sound practical sense in the handling of doctrinal matters, by a certain delicate tact, which led him to avoid everything which was really offensive. In replying to the question,[1] Into what is the body of Christ converted after it has been eaten? — he says: "So uneasy are the thoughts of mortals, that they will never leave exploring, and especially into those things respecting which man ought not to inquire at all. If we seek after the bodily presence of Christ, we must look for it in heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God. Only for a certain time he exhibited his bodily presence, in order to invite to the spiritual. As long as the sacrament is held in the hand, and eaten, Christ is bodily present with that which is seen, felt, and tasted. But when the bodily senses discern nothing more, the bodily presence must no further be sought after, but we must hold ourselves only to the spiritual. After the administration of the sacrament is finished, Christ passes from the mouth into the heart. He is not food for the body, but for the soul." He then adds: "As it regards the relation to ourselves (to our perceptions), he preserves throughout the resemblance to perishable food. But as it regards himself, he loses not the truth of the (unchangeable) body. That which outwardly appears (the species) is sometimes nibbled or stained, but no such affection can reach the true body of Christ. But if the question is asked, whether Christ spaciously descends from or ascends to heaven, when he offers or withdraws his bodily presence, or whether it is after some other manner that he begins or ceases to be present, under the species of the sacrament? I answer, that in such matters we ought not to be too curious, lest we arrogate to ourselves more than belongs to us. I know not how Christ comes, but neither do I know how he departs; *He* knows, from whom nothing is hidden." To escape the conclusion that the body of Christ may be nibbled by mice, burned by fire, etc., he preferred rather to resort to a twofold miracle,— that, in the same manner as the substance of the bread had been converted into the body of Christ, so, afterwards, in place of it, the substance of the bread is created anew, of which substance, the accidents only had remained.[2] In favor of this view, Bonaventura

[1] Lib. iv. c. xv.

[2] Sicut miraculose substantia panis con

also declared himself; the thought undoubtedly floating before his mind that such things belonged to a higher province of the intuition of faith, and ought not to be brought down to this sensuous and conceptual mode of contemplation.[1] With regard to that other mode of apprehension, he observes, "that, however much might be said in proof of this opinion, it will never be so proved that pious ears must not be shocked at it."[2] He was inclined to admit, with pope Innocent the Third, in order to unite the hypothesis that the body of Christ in the eucharist was present only for the use of man,[3] — with the doctrine of transubstantiation, — that the above-mentioned double miracle took place. The dread of such conclusions, and dissatisfaction with those forced resolutions of the difficulty whereby men sought to guard against such conclusions, would lead many reflecting minds to entertain doubts with regard to the premises themselves, from which such conclusions were derived. A master in the university of Paris wrote, in the year 1264, a letter,[4] to pope Clement the Fourth, in which he defended that scientific institution against a charge which was said to have proceeded from the pope himself, that the opinion prevailed there that the eucharist stood no otherwise related to Christ than as the symbol stands related to the thing signified by it.[5] Such an accusation, against which the university had occasion to defend itself, may not perhaps have been altogether without foundation; though it did not contain one word of literal truth. Accordingly, there stood forth among the members of this university, towards the close of the thirteenth century, an independent thinker, — well known on account of his skill in dispute, — the Dominican John of Paris,[6] who endeavored to avoid the above-mentioned conclusions by calling up once more[7] that opinion which, as we have seen, had not yet been lost sight of in the twelfth century, — the opinion that the body of Christ, abiding in its proper essence, was united with the substance of the bread and wine abiding in their proper essence, after the same manner as the divine nature is united with the human in Christ. According to this view, a mutual transfer and interchange of predicates might find place, as in the case of the two natures of Christ; and so these offensive conclusions might be avoided. He supposed that, as the orthodox faith in this doctrine consisted simply in maintaining the real and veritable presence of the body of Christ, so a determinate representation of the manner in which this came to pass could not — while still other representations were also possible — obtain the authority of an

vertitur in corpus dominicum, cum incipit esse sub sacramento, sic quodammodo miraculose revertitur, cum ipsum ibi desinit esse, non quod illa panis substantia revertatur, quae transivit in carnem, sed quod ejus loco alius miraculose creatus.

[1] His words: Caveat tamen quisque qualiter intelligit, quia in hoc secretum fidei latet.

[2] Quantumcunque haec opinio muniatur, nunquam tamen adeo munitur, quando aures piae hoc abhorreant audire.

[3] Quia Christus non est sub illo sacramento, nisi catenus, quod ordinabile est ad usum humanum, scilicet ad manducationem.

[4] See Boulaei hist. univers. Parisiens, t. iii, f. 374.

[5] Esse sicuti signatum sub signo.

[6] Johannes puugens asinos, Pique d'âne, so called, because his disputations left no quiet to indolent minds.

[7] His Determinatio, published by Peter Allix, London, 1686.

article of faith. He believed, moreover, that he might affirm the words of the institution were more favorable to his own view than to the opposite one.[1] He was not in favor of directly condemning the common representation, but only contended against its being held as the alone valid one; while at the same time he avowed submission to the authority of the pope and of the church. Yet he was prohibited in 1304, from reading and disputing. He appealed to the pope, but died at Rome, while the matter was still under discussion. The transmutation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ being regarded as the highest miracle, and one daily repeated, and this highest pitch of the miraculous and of the self-communication of God, being a matter which particularly busied the religious feelings and the imaginations of men, it is no wonder that visions should grow out of it; and such visions may have been the occasion which led to the founding of a festival extremely agreeable to this bent of devotion, and consecrated to the remembrance of this abiding miracle,— the festum Corporis Domini, or *Corpus-Christi* day, which, after it had first arisen — as it is said, in the diocese of Liege — was established in 1264, by a bull of pope Urban the Fourth; although, as this pope soon afterwards died, the ordinance did not at first pass generally into effect, but had afterwards, in 1311, to be renewed by Clement the Fifth.

It was in correspondence with these views, that as Christ, veiled beneath these external signs, was contemplated as actually present and inseparably connected with them, so the worship due to him was tranferred to them. And accordingly it had been the custom, even before these views had reached their extreme point in the doctrine of transubstantiation, for the community, at the elevation of the consecrated emblems, to kneel to the ground; and, in general, Christ himself was worshipped in them, as appears from many indications, especially in the East, where, as a common thing, the feelings were more strongly expressed.[2] This was a necessary expression of those modes of intuition which, after they had reached their highest point in the doctrine of transubstantiation, would, of course, be still further promoted. The papal legate, cardinal Guido, whom pope Innocent the Third sent to Cologne, is said to have first introduced the custom, already practised in Italy, of kneeling before the host, elevated after the consecration, and when borne in procession to the sick, into those districts of Germany,[3] and pope Honorius the Third, by a constitution enacted in 1217, made this a law for the whole church. From this reverence for the external signs in the eucharist, this anxious dread of spilling a drop of the blood of Christ, proceeded, however, at the same time, one salutary change, which may have been already introduced of itself, through the better understanding of the relation of the eucharist to baptism, as it *certainly* found therein a basis of support. We have already seen, in the earlier periods, how the communion of

[1] Quod ista opinio evidentius salvat veritatem hujus propositionis: hoc est corpus meum, et quod in altari sit corpus Christi, quam alia.

[2] See vol. ii, p. 294.

[3] See Caesar. Heisterbac. Dial. Dist. ix, c. li.

infants spread abroad in connection with infant baptism, while men were unconscious of the real difference between the two sacraments, and, from a false construction put upon what Christ says, in the sixth chapter of the gospel according to John, respecting the eating of his flesh and blood, drew the conclusion that, without partaking of the holy supper, it was impossible to obtain eternal life. In such cases, it was customary to let infants, who were incapable as yet of eating anything solid, merely sip a portion of the consecrated wine.[1] But inasmuch as it was now feared, lest the blood of Christ might thus be profaned, while yet men were not bold enough to abandon at once the ancient custom, it came about that, in preference to dropping the practice altogether, it was preferred to take up with an unmeaning ceremony, and give to infants unconsecrated wine.[2] This practice, Hugo a S. Victore justly declared to be altogether superfluous; and wished rather that the whole ceremony might be dispensed with, if it could be done without giving scandal to the simple-minded;[3] and he expressed it as his opinion that, if danger was to be apprehended in preserving the blood of Christ, or in offering the same to infants, it were better that the whole ceremony should be omitted, inasmuch as infants belonged already to the body of Christ by baptism, and were thereby secured in possession of all the benefits which flow from union with him; in favor of which view he quoted a saying of Augustin, to whose authority it was the custom to appeal in support of the communion of infants. From these words of Hugo, it is manifest that, besides the above-mentioned anxiety, the consciousness of the difference between the sacrament of baptism, as that whereby the subject was supposed to be, once for all, incorporated into fellowship with Christ and entitled to participate in all the benefits grounded therein, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper as that which referred to the continued, *conscious*, and self-active appropriation of this fellowship, the consciousness of such a difference between the two sacraments, contributed some share towards promoting the abandonment of infant communion.[4] Already, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, the communion of infants was considered to be a thing altogether inadmissible. As piety in children, more or less pure or mingled with fanaticism,[5] belonged among the

[1] See vol. i, p. 333. Hugo a S. V. de caeremoniis, sacramentis, officiis et observationibus ecclesiasticis, lib. i, c. xx: Pueris recens natis idem sacramentum in specie sanguinis est ministrandum digito sacerdotis, quia tales naturaliter sugere possunt.

[2] L. c. Ignorantia presbyterorum adhuc formam retinens, sed non rem, dat eis loco sanguinis vinum.

[3] Quod penitus supervacuum arbitrares, si sine scandalo simplicium dimitti posset.

[4] In the fifth canon of the council of Bordeaux (concilium Burdegalense), in 1255, it is already presupposed that children belonged to the class of the *prohibiti communicare*; and it is only specially decreed that the priests should not, on the Easter festival, give them the consecrated host instead of the communion. Only common consecrated bread (*panis benedictus communis*) — still a remnant, therefore, of the ancient usage — should be given them. Harduin. Concil. t. vii, f. 471.

[5] Thus, for example, in 1213, a summons issued by a youth led to a fanatical excitement that hurried away a vast multitude of boys to a crusade, who could not be kept back by any of the means employed, gentle or severe. See Thom. Cantipratani Bonum universale, lib. ii, c. iii, § 14, and Matth. Paris. hist. Angl. An. 1251, f. 710. Ed. Lond. 1686.

peculiar features of this age, so an example of this sort occurred in the year 1220, at Thoroult in Flanders. A boy, on whose tender mind religion had made a powerful impression, and who was looked upon as a prodigy of youthful piety, died before he had completed his seventh year. Before his death, he expressed an earnest desire to partake of the holy eucharist. It being supposed, however, that, according to the then existing laws of the church,[1] this privilege could not be granted him, when he found that he was about to die, stretching forth his hands to heaven, he exclaimed: "Thou, Lord Jesus Christ, knowest that my greatest desire is to have thee; I have longed after thee, and done all in my power to obtain thee; and I confidently hope that I am now going to behold thee."

The consideration, however, which, in the manner above described, was the occasion of introducing a change in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, corresponding to its idea, contributed to promote the extensive spread of another innovation, directly at variance with this idea. In the earlier centuries, it was held indispensably necessary that the holy supper, in conformity with its institution, should be distributed fully, in both kinds, to all without distinction, and should be partaken of by all.[2] The only exception was when, as in the North African church, a portion of the consecrated bread was kept at hand, as a means of constantly maintaining communion with Christ, and as a supernatural preservative against all manner of evil; and when the wine alone was used for the communion of infants; which customs already implied, and indeed were based on, the opinion that, in cases of necessity, the communion in one kind might be substituted in place of the whole. Now the fear we have already mentioned, of spilling the least particle of Christ's blood, led, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, especially in England, to the custom of presenting, in the communion of the sick, only a portion of bread dipped in the consecrated wine. And as this was a proceeding already at variance with the words of the institution and the nature of the sacrament, both as to form and matter,[3] so it formed a medium of transition to the practice of distributing the sacrament to the sick, under the single species of the consecrated bread.[4] The same anxiety was the occasion also that, in here and there an instance, this custom should be extended still further, and that partaking of the blood of Christ should be withheld altogether from the laity. That idea of the priesthood, which placed the laity at such a distant remove from the clergy, would furnish ground for the opinion that it was enough if they, by whose instrumentality this greatest of miracles

[1] Thomas Cantiprat, in relating this story, lib. ii, c. xxviii, § 7, speaks of an ordinance passed by a general council prohibiting this: but no such canon of a general council is known to me.

[2] See vol. ii, p. 330.

[3] Hildebert of Mans says, concerning a custom of this sort (ep. 15): Quod nec ex dominica institutione nec ex sanctionibus authenticis reperitur assumptum.

[4] The words of the abbot Rudolph of Liege, which Bona has given in his work De rebus liturgicis: —

Hinc et ibi cautela fiet,
Ne presbyter aegris et sanis
Tribuat laicis de sanguine Christi, nam fundi posset leviter
Simplexque putaret, quod non sub specie sit totus Jesus utraque.

was accomplished, and the sacrifice of Christ continually offered anew, enjoyed the holy supper in its complete form, as it had been instituted by our Saviour;[1] since in fact the priests offered for all, and acted in the name of all who were united with them by fellowship of spirit.[2] Thus, then, a full and perfect observance was to be paid, by the priests, to all that the institution of Christ required. On the part of the laity, reverence towards the sacrament was to be the most prominent thing; and, in accordance with this reverence, they should abstain from the blood, that none of it might be spilled and profaned.[3] This was the acme of that spiritual aristocracy which stood in such contradiction to the idea of the Christian church; and it needed but one step more to proclaim, "it was sufficient for the priests to celebrate the communion in behalf of the entire community." There was still another element, belonging to the Christian mode of thinking in this age, that contributed to encourage and uphold this change, namely, the power attributed to the church, by virtue of the Holy Spirit which guided it, of introducing changes in the administration of the sacraments, according to the necessities of the times; and the power was stretched to this extent.[4] The principle, right in itself, of distinguishing between the mutable and the immutable in the celebration of the sacraments, was, by reason of those false assumptions, falsely applied. Furthermore, this change found another ground of support in the doctrine of concomitance, so called; which, however, was neither devised nor got up for this purpose, but had been first evolved independently thereof,[5] and was first employed by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century,[6] in defence of the withdrawal of the cup, — the doctrine that, under each species, the whole of Christ was contained, *per concomitantiam*, therefore under the body, the blood; so that he who partook of but one species, lost nothing.

It was above a century, however, before the scruples against a

[1] As Thomas Aquinas says: Quod perfectio hujus sacramenti non est in usu fidelium, sed in consecratione materiae. Et ideo nihil derogat perfectioni hujus sacramenti, si populus sumat corpus sine sanguine, dummodo sacerdos consecrans sumat utrumque.

[2] Conformably to that which Thomas Aquinas says: Quia sacerdos in persona omnium sanguinem offert et sumit.

[3] As Thomas says: Ex parte sumentium requiritur summa reverentia et cautela, ne aliquid accidat, quod vergat ad injuriam tanti mysterii.

[4] Thus already in the letter of Ernulph, bishop of Rochester, near the beginning of the twelfth century, in which, in replying to the doubts proposed to him by a certain Lambert, he states how the Hodierna ecclesiae consuetudo of distributing the hostia sanguine intincta, alio et paene contrario ritu, quam a Domino distributum might be justified. He supposes that everything ordained by Christ for man's salvation ought to be observed, indeed, as a matter of unconditional necessity; but that changes might be made in the form of administration, respecting which Christ had established nothing definite. "Quae praecepta sunt, non fieri non licere, pro ratione vero necessitatis vel honestatis alio et alio modo fieri licere." And he could cite other changes in proof of this, changes which the church had introduced on grounds of reason. "Unde nonnulla Christianae religionis instituta eum in ecclesiae nascentis initio modum originis accepere, quem in progressu ejusdem crescentis propter quasdam rationabiles causas non diu tenuere." — See D'Achery Spicileg. t. iii. f. 470. We must allow, however, that when the mutable and the immutable, in respect to matter and form, were distinguished by such inexact limits, a wide field would be opened for arbitrary procedures.

[5] For example, by Anselm of Canterbury.

[6] After the precedent of bishop Ernulph.

deviation from the institution of Christ and the ancient and universal custom of the church could be wholly overcome. Not only was this change not approved in the twelfth century, except in single portions of the church, but even a pope, Paschalis the Second, declared himself decidedly opposed to it. In a letter to Pontius, abbot of Cluny, he wrote that no arbitrary will of man, nor innovating spirit, ought to be allowed to deviate from the course that Christ had ordained. As Christ communicated bread and wine, each by itself, and it ever had been so observed in the church, it ever should be so done in the future, save in the case of infants and of the sick, who, as a general thing, could not eat bread."[1] Yet the withdrawal of the cup, favored by the highest authorities of the thirteenth century, the first theologians of both the orders of mendicants, among whom Albert the Great constitutes the only exception, constantly advanced to more general recognition. Near the close of the twelfth century, the provost Folmar of Traufenstein, in France, took ground against the doctrine of concomitance employed to defend the withdrawal of the cup; and he seems by this opposition to have been driven to a view of the Lord's supper deviating from the church doctrine, although he was too much confined by his dependence on the authority of the church to be able to make that which he wanted wholly clear to himself, and to carry it out in a consistent manner. He agreed, it is true, that the true body of Christ was in the eucharist; but he supposed not wholly, with all its members, as Christ had lived on earth; that the whole Christ was, by virtue of the union of the two natures, in each species, but not the whole, completely, in all its parts. In each species, he would probably say, he is present only in one particular form.[2] As he maintained that, even by Christ's glorification, the difference of the predicates, applied to the two natures, was not annulled, so he contended against the supposition of an ubiquity; and held, on the contrary, that Christ, till the time of his second advent, abode, with his glorified body, only in heaven. When his opponents brought up against him the stories which had gone abroad since the time of Paschasius Radbert, about actual manifestations of the body and blood of Christ, he declared such stories to be false: he looked upon them as mere fables, that harmonized in no sort with the doctrine of Holy Scripture. The sources from which these legends had been derived, he considered as not entitled to the least credit.[3] Thus we perceive that, at bottom, he possessed an origi-

[1] Harduin. Concil., t. vi, p. ii, f. 1796.

[2] Totus, sed non totum et non totaliter.

[3] Gerhoh of Reichersberg says, in the work directed against him, and intituled De gloria et honore filii hominis, c. xiii, in Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, t. i, p. ii, f. 221: Folmar had asserted, dictis et scriptis, corpus Domini, ex quo ascendit, nunquam fuisse sub coelo. Cui cum nos inter caetera objiceremus, quod multi sanctorum viderint eum corporaliter, postquam ascendit in coelum, sicut corporaliter visus est Petro, dixit hoc totum esse fabulosum. Neque canonicis fultum scripturis. — Gerhoh now argues that, according to the position of his antagonist, the account given by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, of Christ's appearance to Paul, should be regarded as fabulous and uncanonical. But it was certainly very far from the intention of his opponent to affirm anything like this. If the latter really expressed the opinion, thus broadly, that Christ could not, after his ascension, again appear on earth, he must have explained this appearance as being a supernatural vision, which,

nal and independent bent of spirit, directly at variance with that of the church. But before he could come to the point of expressing it, in a clear and consistent manner, he was induced to recant.[1]

That view of the Lord's supper which represented the miracle performed by the priests as the principal thing, did not serve to promote the participation of the laity in the sacrament. One evidence that shows how far this was from being the case, is the twenty-first canon of the Lateran council in 1215, whereby it is ordained that every one should partake of the holy supper at least once a year, on the Easter festival. Whoever failed of so doing was to be excluded from church fellowship, and, at his death, to be refused burial according to the rites of the church. So much the greater reliance was placed on the priestly sacrifice of the mass; and the vast multitude of unworthy ecclesiastics turned it into a means of gain. Such persons undertook, for the sake of the profit, to hold more masses than they could themselves perform. They entered into contracts to perform a certain number of masses, which they obligated themselves to hold for twenty or thirty years; and when they had undertaken more than they were able to perform, hired assistants, who went through with a mechanical performance of the liturgical acts in their stead. Pious individuals[2] contended against this abuse as a most abominable species of simony, Christ himself being here held up for sale, as he was by Judas. The free-spirited Abelard declaimed against the cupidity of the priests by whom many, even when dying, were deceived with the idle promise of salvation, if they should secure a sufficient number of masses, which however could not be had without pay. "They advise these dying men," says he, "not to restore what they have robbed from others, but to offer it for the sacrifice of the mass."[3] The ecclesiastical assemblies at length considered it necessary to enact laws against such abuses.[4] These abuses were not necessarily connected, we admit, with that particular mode of intuition of which we have been speaking; on the contrary, the loftiness of the transaction, as an offering of Christ, was appealed to in order to expose the detestable character of this traffic:[5] but the whole of this external-

however, it is hardly credible that he did. Probably, he only spoke of those tales, altogether fabulous both in matter and form, which were commonly made use of, in defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[1] The sources are to be found in the above-cited volume of the collection by Pez, and in the 25th volume of the Bibl. patr. Lugd. It is to be regretted that we possess but a few fragments of Folmar himself.

[2] As, for instance, Petrus Cantor, verbum abbreviatum, c. xxvii et xxviii.

[3] Multos morientium seducit cupiditas sacerdotum, vanam eis securitatem promittentium, si quae habent, sacrificiis obtulerint, et missas emant, quas nequaquam gratis haberent. In quo quidem mercimonio praefixum apud eos pretium constat esse, pro una scilicet missa unum denarium, et pro uno annuali quadraginta. In his Ethics or his Scito te ipsum, c. xviii, in Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, p. ii, f. 666.

[4] See the Council of Paris, of the year 1212: Ne pro annalibus vel triennalibus vel septennalibus missarum faciendis laïci vel alii dare aliquid vel legare cogantur in testamento, et ne super his aliqua pactio vel exactio vel sub aliqua alia specie palliata a sacerdotibus vel aliis mediatoribus fiat, et ne superflua multitudine talium annalium se onerent sacerdotes, ad quae supplenda sufficere honeste non possint et propter quae ipsos oporteat habere conductitios sacerdotes.

[5] The greater guilt incurred in the profanation of this sacrament by simony, Petr. Cant., c. xxvii: Totus enim Christus ibi sumitur fons et origo omnium gratiarum.

izing, magic-seeking bent, furnished, to say the least, a foothold for such superstition and such profanation.

In the administration of the sacrament of penance, the mischief-working abuses of the church stand forth with particular prominence. But on this point, we must take care to distinguish the false representations of the church-doctrine, which were encouraged by ignorant and badly-disposed preachers, from that doctrine as it was taught in the schools of theology. Men were aware of the distinction between the divine forgiveness of sin, and church absolution. It was acknowledged that the former could be obtained only by the *inward* confession of sin, and that true repentance which springs from love. When a priest inquired of Yves, bishop of Chartres, how the practice of the church — to exclude those who confessed their sins for a season from partaking of the eucharist — was to be reconciled with the words of the prophet Ezekiel,— that the sinner shall live if he but sighs to God, and returns from his evil ways ; the bishop replied : " To that Judge who looks upon the heart, inward conversion, and the contrition of the heart, sufficeth ; and the forgiveness of sin is immediately bestowed by him to whom this inward conversion is manifest. But the church requires a public satisfaction, because she cannot know the secrets of the heart."[1] Peter Lombard declared, that the power to bind and to loose bestowed on the priest, did not consist in this, that he actually had it in his power to forgive sins and confer justification, which was the work of God alone. The priest could only declare the judgment of God ;[2] and the priestly sentence was valid only when it agreed with the divine. He distinguished, therefore, between absolution in the sight of God, and in the view of the church.[3] But in holding fast to the inward requisites, — necessary in order to the obtaining of the divine forgiveness of sin,— men were, at the same time, at no loss for reasons to justify everything that prevailed in the practice of the church. That interior state of the soul,— genuine contrition of heart, — must necessarily express itself by some outward and corresponding sign. Inward humiliation before God must exhibit itself by the outward self-humiliation of penance before the priest. The inward confession of sins must be accompanied with an outward confession ; the inward self-castigation for sin, in *contrition*, by penitential exercises voluntarily undertaken according to the direction of the priest. So the three following parts of penance, as determined by Peter of Lombardy, ever continued to be held fast : the *compunctio cordis*, the *confessio oris*, and the *satisfactio operis*. In the doctrine, that for sins committed subsequently to baptism, it was required that a peculiar species of satisfaction should be paid to divine justice, the necessity of church penance found its substantial basis. And the effects of it might, in the next place, extend even beyond the bounds of the present life ; for after it had once been determined that such a species of justification was necessary, it was easy to infer from it, that whoso-

[1] See ep. 228.

[2] Ostendere hominem ligatum vel solutum.

[3] Solutio apud Deum et in facie ecclesiae.

ever neglected to pay such satisfaction in the present life, would have to suffer hereafter, for the purpose of expiation and purification, so much the severer pains in the fires of purgatory. At the same time, however, it was supposed that the above-mentioned inward self-punishment might be of sufficient force to be substituted in place of all other satisfactions; so that the individual thus circumstanced stood exempted from the necessity of enduring the fires of purgatory. At all events, the church doctrine and scientific theology were very far from attributing any important influence to the external act separated from the internal disposition. The temper of the heart was ever held up to view as that from which everything must proceed. But the blame lies with the ordinary priests, that this connection between the inward temper and outward act, in the religious sense of the multitude, was obscured, and that the people were confirmed in the delusive notion that forgiveness of sin could be obtained by outward works, and in their mistaken confidence on priestly absolution, which was often but too easily bestowed. The laws enacted by the first popes of this period, had for their object to counteract such abuses. Thus it undoubtedly belonged to the essence of the Hildebrandian reform of the church, that on this point also the ancient order of the church should be restored. We have noticed already, on a former page,[1] the interest taken in this matter by Gregory the Seventh. Pope Urban the Second declared,[2] that "Whereas, false penance belongs especially among the causes which disturb the peace of the church; therefore, we admonish the bishops and priests against deceiving the souls of the laity by false penance and thus causing them to be hurried to perdition. But false penance is, where penance is done on account of one sin to the overlooking of many others." In confutation of this error, which led men to suppose that they had done enough by leaving off one class of sins, while they still indulged themselves in others, the pope quotes James 2: 10: "It is also denominated false penance, for one not to abandon the business of an ordinary calling which he cannot pursue without sin, or to harbor hatred in his heart; or to refuse satisfaction to one whom he has wronged, or forgiveness for wrongs he has himself received, or to bear arms against a righteous cause." Yet the authorities at Rome did not remain true to these principles of ecclesiastical legislation, when they too easily granted absolution to those who from other lands resorted to the highest tribunal; and a mischief-working change, in the matter of absolution, proceeded from that very quarter.

In the first place, by virtue of the monarchical ecclesiastical power of the popes, it was possible to introduce, instead of the absolutions hitherto dispensed by the bishops in behalf of their respective dioceses, a more general absolution, valid for the whole church; and while it was the case hitherto, that absolution was only limited and partial in its extent, another kind now appeared in its stead, of wider grasp, which tended to the dispensing with all church penance. The crusades

[1] Page 91.

[2] Concilium Melfitanum. c. xvi. Harduin, vii, f 1687.

furnished the first occasion for this. Pope Victor the Third, when preaching a crusade against the infidels in North Africa, having first set a precedent of this sort, it was often followed on occasion of the crusades to the Holy Sepulchre; when it was held that the participation in so holy an enterprise ought to be considered a valid substitute for all other penance; and so a full and unconditional absolution came to be connected therewith. Yet it must be allowed that true devotion and penitence were still appended as a condition. Thus, for example, Urban the Second, at the council of Clermont, in 1095, extended this indulgence expressly to those alone who, from motives of simple piety, and not for the sake of honor or of money, embarked in the expedition to liberate the church at Jerusalem. But the crimes to which the crusaders abandoned themselves, testify of the immense injury that grew out of the confidence in the power of absolution.

Absolution received a theoretical support from the theologians of the thirteenth century. They were directed thereto by that idea of Christian fellowship, — though conceived after a false and external manner, — which generally exercised so vast a power over the religious life of these times, — the sense of that fellowship of divine life by which everything was upborne that proceeded from the Christian spirit, — the conviction that each one, through the fellowship of the same spirit, — which works everything in all its organs, — shared in all the benefits accruing from that spirit, — the invisible bond that knit together all Christians, however separated by time and space. Hence the notion of a treasury of merits, belonging to the whole church. In addition to this, came now that representation, which in earlier periods we saw already existing in the bud, and which had its ground in a false apprehension of the idea of the law, — the representation, namely, that the saints possessed a superlegal perfection,[1] — had performed more than justice required in satisfaction for their own sins; where, to be sure, the treasure of Christ's merits was assumed as the foundation of the whole, without which it was vain to talk of human merit.[2] — Christ was pointed to, as the primal source of all sanctification.[3] Thus arose the doctrine of a *thesaurus meritorum supererogationis*, from which the church, and especially its visible head, could, for reasonable causes, — as, for example, for the advancement of a holy work of general importance, — appropriate to individuals whatever might be requisite, as a satisfaction for their own sins. It was at the same time held fast, we allow, that the indulgence so bestowed was not *forgiveness* of sin, but only a remission of the church-penance, which would otherwise have to be fulfilled by each. Yet, as this was to take the

[1] Thus Thomas of Aquino says (Supplement. tertiae partis summae theol. Qu. xiii, Art. i): Est quaedam mensura homini adhibita, quae ab eo requiritur, scilicet impletio mandatorum Dei, et superea potest aliquid erogare, ut satisfaciat.

[2] Robert Pullein still speaks only of a treasure of the merits of Christ: cujus merita praecedentium patrum insufficientiam supplerent, ut merita antiquorum per Christum accepta Deo digna fiant munerari coelo.

[3] Thus pope Innocent the Third, in his exposition of the second penitential psalm, says: Satis enim apparet, quis orat, quoniam omnis sanctus, videlicet servus sanctificatus, et ad quem orat, quoniam ad te, videlicet Dominum sanctificantem, et quare orat, quia pro hac, id est, pro impietatis remissione, quae sanctificationis est causa, f. 241.

place of the punishment which must otherwise be suffered in purgatory, it followed that the effects of this indulgence might bear indirectly even upon the forgiveness of sin.[1] Beyond question, it was still presupposed, that they who received the indulgence were in a state of true penitence, and by faith and love united to the saints, whose merits were placed over to their account. Had the doctrine of indulgence always been taught and received with these limitations, it might not have been so injurious to morality as it in fact proved to be. But the unspiritual men, who were determined to gain the utmost which they possibly could from an indulgence granted for the building of a church, for the visitation of the same, etc., sought only to fix a high value on their spiritual merchandise, and were extremely careful how they added anything in the way of limitation. William of Auxerre,[2] a scholastic theologian of the thirteenth century, after having laid down six propositions necessary for the understanding of the doctrine of indulgence, very naïvely observes: "If we should state all these explanations in preaching the doctrine of indulgences, the latter would not find so many purchasers; just as the laity, if they should understand that one good work is worth as much as a hundred others, performed with only the same amount of love, would not be inclined to do so many good works.[3] Still, however, the church does not deceive the faithful; for she teaches nothing false, but only conceals certain truths."[4] Also, Thomas Aquinas cites the opinion of some, who believed that the benefit of indulgences was, in the case of each individual, according to the measure of his faith and piety;[5] — yet this dependence of indulgences on the personal character of the subject was not expressed in the preaching of them; for the church incited men to good works by means of a *pious fraud*, like the mother who holds out an apple to her child to induce it to walk. Yet he himself repelled such a doctrine with abhorrence, declaring it to be fraught with danger, since thereby all confidence in the affirmations of the church would necessarily be weakened.

The enormous abuses which came to be connected with the matter of indulgences, called forth against it many important voices in the church; some attacking nothing but that which was not grounded in the church doctrine, but was solely to be attributed to the corruption of the clergy; and some making war against the whole system of indulgences. Abelard complains of the priests that betrayed the

[1] There were those who considered absolution as referring simply to the penalties incurred at the tribunal of the church; but Thomas Aquinas combats this opinion; as, in fact, he was obliged to do, by the connection of ideas in the church doctrine; for the remissio, quae fit quantum ad forum ecclesiae, valet etiam quantum ad forum Dei et praeterea ecclesiae hujusmodi indulgentias faciens magis damnificaret quam adjuvaret, quia remitteret ad graviores poenas scilicet purgatorii.

[2] Guilelmus Antissiodorensis.

[3] His words: Quia si determinarentur, non essent fideles ita proni ad dandum, sicut si praedicaretur laïcis, quod quantum valet unum opus meritorium ad vitam aeternam, tantum et mille facta ex tanta caritate, non essent ita proni ad faciendum bona opera.

[4] Ecclesia decipit fideles, tamen non mentitur. See the summa in iv. libb. sententiar, l. iv of the chapter, de relaxationibus, quae fiunt per claves.

[5] Quod indulgentiae non tantum valent, quantum praedicantur, sed unicuique tantum valent, quantum fides et devotio sua exigit.

souls committed to their spiritual oversight, not so much through ignorance as cupidity, the love of money availing more with them than the will of their Master.[1] Even the bishops were fiercely attacked by him. He reproached them on account of the lavish manner in which they dispensed indulgences at the dedication of churches and altars, at the consecration of burial-places, and on other occasions of popular festivity; under the show, indeed, of love, but really impelled by the grossest cupidity.[2] True love for their flocks, he suspected, would be shown by their bestowing these indulgences for nothing. If it lay within their power to open and shut heaven, they ought not to suffer an individual of their flocks to perish. But they might well be congratulated if they were able to open heaven even for themselves;[3] he declared it impossible that the arbitrary will of bishops should bring anything to pass against the justice of the divine tribunal, or that any unjust sentence should be confirmed by the Almighty. With Origen, whose words he cites, he maintained that the power conferred on the apostles to bind and to loose, had not been communicated to the bishops as the apostles' successors in office, but only to those among them who were the apostles' successors in temper of mind; just as the words, "Ye are the salt of the earth," applied only to such.[4]

When a bountiful indulgence was offered to the abbot Stephen of Obaize, to assist in the erection of a church which he had much at heart, he declined accepting it, saying: "We have no wish to introduce a custom whereby we should prepare a scandal for the communities, and shame for ourselves, in assuming to give an indulgence which God alone can bestow."[5] And when, in despite of this, he once allowed himself to be persuaded to receive a letter of indulgence in behalf of certain persons about to form a fraternity for the purpose of erecting a new church, and he was asked, while the letter was being drawn up, how far he would have the indulgence extend, his ancient scruples were revived, and he said: "Our own sins still weigh heavy on us, and we cannot make light of those of others."[6]

The Franciscan Berthold constantly declaims with the greatest vehemence against the preachers of indulgences, whom he was accustomed to call penny-preachers, and whom he describes as the deadliest traitors to souls, the murderers of true penitence: "These penny-preachers, who discourse so finely before the people concerning God, in order that they may strip them of their money; so they leave off confession, and comfort themselves with their indulgences. Because such an one (such a preacher of indulgences) can discourse so very eloquently about God, they fancy he is a saint. He is as really the

[1] Ut pro nummorum oblatione satisfactionis injunctae poenas condonent vel relaxent, non tam attendentes, quid velit Dominus, quam quid valeat nummus.

[2] Sub quadam scilicet specie caritatis, sed in veritate summae cupiditatis.

[3] Quod quidem si non possunt, vel nesciunt, certe illud poëticum, in quantum arbitror, incurrunt :—

Nec prosunt domino, quae prosunt omnibus, artes.

[4] See Abelard's Ethics, c. xxvi. Pez. l. c. f. 682.

[5] Nos talem consuetudinem introducere nolumus, et populis scandalum et nobis ignominiam acquiramus circumeundo ecclesias, ostendendo beneficia, indulgentias largiendo, quas dare non poterit nisi solus Deus.

[6] Nos nostra adhuc premunt peccata nec possumus levare aliena. Lib. ii, c. xviii.

devil's as he stands there and cheats Christendom. He is as much the devil's as any robber in the forest. And had I to choose, I would rather, an' there were no help for it, my soul should pass out of the mouth of a robber than out of the mouth of a penny-preacher; for the former ruins but his own soul, while the penny-preacher ruins many thousands besides. For all who are lost by means of his false indulgences, are cast to the bottom of hell, while he must suffer all their torments as his own. As Judas sold his Lord, so thou sellest away from him many thousand souls, beyond all hope of retrieve."[1] "Fie! on thee, penny-preacher, murderer of the whole world! How many souls dost thou, for the sake of thy false gain, seduce from true repentance and cast to the bottom of hell, beyond all reach of help? Thou promisest a large indulgence for a penny or a farthing; so that many thousands foolishly imagine they have expiated all their sins with their penny, or their farthing, as thou snufflest out to them. So they leave off confessing themselves; and thus go on to perdition, with none to tell them better. And for this thou shalt be cast to the bottom of hell, and all these shall be cast upon thee, thou who hast seduced and sold them away from Almighty God! Yes, souls! for a penny, or a farthing! Thou murderer of true penitence; thou hast destroyed for us true penitence. This the penny-preachers have so utterly destroyed for us, that there is now scarcely an individual who is willing to confess his sins."[2] He describes these preachers as being the vilest of hypocrites, who pretended to great piety, and understood how to set forth the sufferings of Christ and of the martyrs in a touching manner, so as to induce the common people to purchase their indulgences: "He dwells so much, and in so many ways, on our Lord's sufferings, that they imagine he is a true messenger of God; then he weeps, and practises all sorts of tricks, that he may get their pennies, and their souls to boot. Oftentimes, the Netherlander affects the speech of the Highlander;[3] for example, the dissembler and penny-preacher, who discourses so much about God and his mother, and his saints, and their sufferings, — and weeps, into the bargain, — so that one might swear he was a true Highlander. By his dress, also, such a person may deceive, but not for any long time by his manners."[4] The popes thought it necessary to enact several laws against the too wide extension of indulgences; and these laws bear testimony also to the great mischief occasioned by them: "Whereas, through the indefinite and superfluous indulgences which many prelates boldly take it upon them to ordain, the keys of the church fall into contempt, and penance loses its virtue; therefore, be it decreed that, at the consecration of a church, whether performed by one bishop or by several, indulgence shall not be extended to any term beyond a year," etc. The pope — who though possessed of plenary power, was still used to set these limits to himself — was held out to them as a pattern.[5] At a

[1] In the edition cited above, on page 150.
[2] Page 290.
[3] Highland, symbol of heaven; Lowland, of hell.
[4] L. c. page 316.
[5] Concil. Lat. iv, 1215, c. lxii.

council held at Beziers in South France,[1] which especially set itself to oppose the sects that were now spreading with such mighty power in those districts, a canon was also drawn up against abuses in the granting of indulgences, — a step undoubtedly connected with the same object; since the mischiefs occasioned by the preachers of indulgences assuredly supplied those sects with a great abundance of reasons for attacking the dominant church. It was decreed that none but suitable persons, furnished with testimonials from their superiors, should be tolerated as preachers of indulgences; "since it was certain that hireling preachers of indulgences and those who used them as hirelings, had no less by their wicked lives than by their erroneous preaching, caused great scandal by promising, for a small sum of money, to procure deliverance for the condemned in hell."[2]

Finally, an ordinance was passed by Pope Innocent the Third, which was expressly designed to counteract the breaking up of the discipline of penance. Confession of particular sins to the priest had, indeed, until now, been recommended, and considered as belonging to the self-humiliation of the delinquent; but it was only in case of mortal sins, involving the exclusion of the subject from the kingdom of heaven, that such confession was held to be indispensably necessary; since, in this case, the three parts of penance distinguished by Peter of Lombardy, must all come together. That which had hitherto been left an optional matter, was by Innocent the Third prescribed as settled law. He directed in the twenty-first canon of the fourth Lateran council, in 1215, that each individual of the male and female sex should, after having arrived at the years of discretion, truly and faithfully confess, for himself alone, all his sins, at least once a year, to his own priest, and strive to perform according to his ability the penance imposed upon him; and at least once a year, on the Easter festival, partake of the holy eucharist; unless, after hearing the advice of his own priest, he thought himself, for good reasons, bound to abstain from it for a season. But if, for good and valid reasons, any one should choose to confess his sins to a foreign priest, he must first ask and obtain permission so to do from his own priest; otherwise, the foreign priest could not exercise the power to bind and to loose. It was especially enjoined on the priest to exercise prudence and wisdom in the care of souls. He was directed to inform himself exactly with regard to the circumstances of the sinner and of his sin, in order that from these data he might be able skilfully to determine what counsel to give, and what remedies to apply. The strictest confidence with regard to the matters confessed was enjoined on the priest, with severe penalties in case of transgression. By means of this introduction of auricular confession into the laws of the church, it was intended to put a check on the loose administration of the penitential system generally; to compel the priest to a more strict moral oversight over his community, and to prevent the laity from withdrawing themselves from it. A stricter discharge of the pastoral duties was thus secured, and the tie more

[1] Concilium Biterrense.

[2] V. Harduin. Concil. t. viii, f. 409

closely knit betwixt the priest and his people. Such a regulation corresponded with the spirit of the church, which would preserve the religious consciousness of the laity in a state of entire dependence on the priest.

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

I. Evolution of Doctrines and of Theology in the Western Church.

From the rudeness of the eleventh century we saw a new spiritual life emerging; and here, too, the new religious awakening was accompanied with the commencement of a new creation in science. Yet these two directions of the new life, the religious and the scientific, did not always work harmoniously together, but also developed themselves independently, side by side; and sometimes, in fact, — as one or the other of them happened to predominate, — they fell into direct opposition to one another. Accordingly, we observe the sudden appearance of a certain dialectical tendency, engendered simply by the self-feeling of the awakened understanding, and not originally animated by any religious interest, which now threatened to come into conflict with the spiritual tendencies that had sprung out of the depths of the religious life. On the one side, was the predominant life of feeling and emotion; on the other, the predominant activity of the understanding and of conception. Already, towards the close of the preceding period, we noticed the strife between a freer mode of inquiry and one which chose to subject itself rather to the authority of church tradition: as it was presented to us, in the one case, in the person of Berengar; in the other, in that of Lanfranc. But the triumph of Lanfranc evinced already to which side the reigning spirit was inclined; at the same time, however, the battle was not yet decided; but the contest must be often repeated ere such a decision could be arrived at, as to fix a standing-point for the present times.

Although there can be no doubt that the dialectical writings of Boethius had a special influence in directing the awakened spirit of philosophical inquiry to the question respecting the objective significance of general conceptions, yet we are not to suppose that this explains everything; for the outward occasion and point of attachment for that which developes itself from an inward principle is one thing, and the true inward principle itself, grounded in the very nature of the process of philosophical development, is another. The most important antagonisms which, under different forms in different ages, are wont to busy the powers of thought, when awakening to freer self-activity, may be recognized in the present case, though men lost them-

selves in a multitude of less important collateral questions and unfruitful dialectical subtleties, before the main questions and antagonisms, lying at the bottom, could be brought into the clear light of consciousness. Under those antagonisms,— which set in movement the dialectic spirits of those times, relating to reality and non reality, to the objective or barely subjective significance of general conceptions, — were enveloped the gravest questions respecting the relation of thought to being, of the universal to the particular. It was the first breaking forth, though still concealed in the bud, and not come as yet to clear self-consciousness, of the controversy between a speculative and dogmatical, and an empirical and skeptical, tendency. It is obvious to remark, therefore, the great importance of the issue of such a contest, in determining the direction of the scientific, and especially, of the theological spirit.

As the dogmatical bent of Augustin exercised the most decided influence on the minds of the age, so the peculiar *realistic* element, which was so closely inwoven with his whole mode of thinking, had, at the same time with the latter, obtained the mastery; and that, too, in the same form in which it appears in his writings, viz., after that partly Platonic and partly Aristotelian mode of apprehension, according to which general conceptions (the *universalia*) were regarded as the archetypes of the divine reason (*universalia ante rem*) and as copied, struck off in the manifold diversity of phenomena — the species lying at the basis of individual beings (*universalia in re*). But a new tendency proceeded from Roscelin, a canonical priest, who, near the close of the eleventh century, founded a peculiar dialectical school at Compiegne. He maintained that all knowledge must proceed from experience; individuals only had real existence; all general conceptions were without objective significance. They were but abstractions, necessary helps of the understanding, to enable it to grasp the infinite manifoldness of things, *nomina non res;* hence the name Nominalism, to designate this school.[1] The skeptical tendency of nominalism may be clearly discerned in his own case, by observing the mode in which he disputes the objective reality of the conceptions, "whole and part," when he says: "The parts must be prior to the whole;" "the whole presupposes the parts, and yet the parts really subsist only in reference to a whole."[2] An internal necessity, however, would impel the minds of this age, so predominantly dogmatical in its tendency, to resist a

[1] I will here notice how that extraordinary man, Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century, of whom we shall have more to say hereafter, states these antagonisms: Aliqui ponunt ea (universalia) solum in anima, aliqui extra, aliqui medio modo. Opus Majus, p. i, c. vi, f. 28.

[2] These doctrines of Roscelin have become more accurately known by means of the fragments of Abelard's dialectics, published by Cousin (Ouvrage inédits d'Abélard. Paris, 1836). Fuit autem, memini, magistri nostri Roscellini tam insana sententia, ut nullam rem partibus constare vellet, sed sicut solis vocibus species, ita et partes adscribebat. Si quis autem rem illam, quae domus est, rebus aliis, pariete scilicet et fundamento constare diceret, tali ipsum argumentatione impugnabat: si res illa, quae est paries, rei illius, quae domus est, pars sit, cum ipsa domus nihil aliud sit, quam ipsa paries et tectum et fundamentum, profecto paries sui ipsius et caeterorum pars erit. At vero quomodo sui ipsius pars fuerit? Amplius omnis pars naturaliter prior est suo toto. Quomodo autem paries prior se et aliis dicetur, cum se nullo modo prior sit? L. c. p. 471

skeptical element so strongly expressed; and this antagonism was the first which particularly occupied the dialecticians.

The university of Paris presented, in the twelfth century, for the first time, a school which gradually became a common centre for all scientific studies. Previous to this, it was only individual men of distinguished talents, teachers in the cathedral and monastic schools, who, by their power of influence on youthful minds, and by their reputation, collected around them the young men from various districts, far and near. So labored the two representatives of the opposite dialectical tendencies, in two neighboring cities, — one at Lisle, the other at Tournay. In the first-named city, Raimbert stood at the head of the Nominalist school. At Tournay, the Cathedral school had become eminent and flourishing, under the care of its great master, Odo, or Udardus; and he, as a realist, was a warm opponent of the dialectician in his neighborhood. The reputation of this scholar brought together young men here from all parts of France, Germany, and the Netherlands. When we think of the rudeness of the times, we must be surprised to learn that such influence could proceed from a man of science, not merely on the narrower circle of his scholars, but upon the city itself in which he lived. Yet so we find it described by one of Raimbert's contemporaries. "If one rambled through the streets of the city, and observed the crowds of disputants, one might imagine that the citizens had abandoned all other business, and occupied themselves with philosophy alone. Coming into the vicinity of the school, one would sometimes behold Odo walking about with his scholars, and instructing them after the manner of the Peripatetics, sometimes sitting in the midst of them, and replying to the questions propounded to him. During the hours of the evening, too, he might be heard, till late into the night, disputing before the church doors, or seen pointing with his finger and explaining to his scholars the course of the stars. His scholars, who numbered two hundred, were warmly and enthusiastically attached to him."[1]

But this undue predominance of one mental direction, the dialectical, this one-sided occupation of the mind with mere formal matter, was attended with its mischievous effects. As well the life and soul, as the material interests of science, would suffer thereby. The new dialecticians were intent on finding for everything some new expression, without any advantage to the matter in hand. In their new-coined Latin words, men fancied they had obtained science. The ingenious advocate of the rights of empirical knowledge against the arrogant pretensions of dialectics, which swallowed up all other interests, John of Salisbury, in the last times of the twelfth century, had to complain that this one-sided logical enthusiasm caused all other studies and all employment of time on the ancients to be despised; that every man was for inventing a new grammar, a new logic; that after the ancient rules had been abolished, new laws for everything were drawn from the

[1] See the history of the abbey at Tournay, by the abbot Hermann, in D'Achery Spicileg. t. ii, f. 889.

depths of philosophy. "To call an ass or a man," says he, "by his common name, was a transgression, a thing unworthy of a philosopher. It was held to be impossible to say or to do anything according to the rules of reason, unless the terms fitness and reason were expressly introduced."[1] "Schools," says the same writer, "became multiplied; since no man was content to be a scholar, but each, borne onward by the approbation of his adherents, would himself be the author of some new thing."[2] When individuals who had been, for a season, exclusively occupied with these matters, became sensible of the idleness of such pursuits, or were brought, by the experiences of life, to a more serious tone of mind,[3] they retired from the world and became regular canonicals or monks.

Yet the change produced by such impressions was not the same in all. As it was usually the case that those who imagined they had renounced the world, not seldom betrayed by their temper that they continued to be the same as before, although changed as to form, so it turned out here that, with many, the old nature soon emerged again; and hence it was easy, as John of Salisbury says, to see, lurking under the monk's cowl, the self-conceit of the philosopher.[4] Others renounced, with their whole soul, the pursuits which, before, they had idly followed; and, giving themselves wholly up to monkish asceticism, studied only how to make sure of salvation. The third class were composed of such as possessed a real inward call to speculation, and who, therefore, by the change of their interior life, could not be induced wholly to abandon it, inasmuch as, by so doing, they must deny the essential character of their own minds, but only took a new direction in the same, and turned it upon objects which, after that change, more particularly occupied their attention.

An example of a change of the last-mentioned kind is furnished in the above-named Odo. Already, for a period of five years, he stood at the head of the above-mentioned realistic school; and indeed, by the severe life which he himself led, and to which he held his scholars, he had made himself universally respected and reverenced. But the study of the Bible and of the ancient fathers of the church, still lay remote from his pursuits, and he busied himself only with the philo-

[1] Solam convenientiam sive rationem loquebantur. Argumentum sonabat in ore omnium et asinum nominare vel hominem aut aliquid operum naturae instar criminis erat et a philosopho alienum. Impossibile credebatur convenienter et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, nisi convenientis et rationis mentio expressim esset inserta. Metalog. lib. i, c. lii.

[2] Recentes magistri e scholis et pulli volucrum e nidis, sicut pari tempore morabantur, sic pariter avolabant.

[3] Such cases must have occurred frequently, as John of Salisbury remarks: (Metalog. lib. i, c. iv) Alii namque monachorum aut clericorum claustrum ingressi sunt et plerique suum correxerunt errorem, deprehendentes in se et aliis praedicantes, quia quicquid didicerant, vanitas vanitatum est et super omnia vanitas.

[4] The noticeable words of John of Salisbury: Si mihi non credis, claustra ingredere, scrutare mores fratrum et invenies ibi superbiam Moab et eam intensam valde, ut arrogantia absorbeat fortitudinem ejus. Miratur Benedictus et queritur, quod se quodammodo auctore latet lupus in pellibus agninis. Utique tonsuram et pullam vestem a supercilio distare causatur. Et ut rectius dixerim, supercilium arguit, eo quod tonsurae vestibusque non consonet. Ritus observationum contemnitur et sub imagine philosophantis spiritus fallacis elationis obrepit.

sophical writings of antiquity, so far as they were then known in the Latin language. Because he strove to imitate the pattern of the ancient philosophers, which, in those times of philosophical enthusiasm, could be the more easily represented as the highest ideal of perfection the less men derived their knowledge of antiquity from credible sources,[1] therefore many were inclined to attribute his severity of life to his emulation of those philosophers, rather than to the spirit of Christian asceticism.[2] On a certain time he happened to purchase of one of his scholars Augustin's work, *De libero arbitrio*, and had thrown the book into his library, without taking any further thought about it. Two months afterwards, however, when he was explaining to his pupils the work of Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, and in so doing was led to speak of freewill, he recollected the new addition he had lately made to his library, and ordered it to be brought to him. So strongly was he interested by it, that from thenceforth he began to expound the whole work to his scholars. Finally, in expounding the third book, he came to a passage which treats of the wretched condition of the souls absorbed in the pursuits of a worldly life, and excluded from the heavenly glory. This he thought himself bound to apply to himself and to the companions of his labors, because their science did not reach beyond the present world. He rose from his chair, and, bursting into tears, took his way to the church. The vanity of the pursuits in which he had hitherto been engaged, rose clearly before his mind; four of his scholars joined him, prepared to follow him anywhere. He got himself admitted among the regular canonicals, became abbot, and afterwards archbishop of Cambray, and now applied his philosophical method to the defence of the doctrines of the church. He wrote a work on original sin, in which it is impossible not to perceive the influence of his philosophical realism. When the different positions of philosophy and theology thus came to be confounded together, out of the violent philosophical controversies, theological ones might easily grow.[3]

This manifested itself in the way in which nominalism was suppressed at its first appearance, by a fusing together of the theological with the philosophical interest. Only, it may be a question whether Roscelin did not depart from the prevailing bent, not merely by his peculiar dialectical theory, but also by his theological principles, and, indeed, the entire position he took in theology, thereby creating great alarm among the followers of that bent. There was unquestionably to be detected, as we have seen, in the dialectics of Roscelin, a skeptical spirit, and a skeptical tendency; and the same spirit might lead to the unsettling of everything, even in matters of Christian faith. The

[1] We shall meet with an example of this further on in Abelard.

[2] The above-mentioned writer of the history of St. Martin's abbey at Tours, cites it as the opinion of some: Eum hanc districtionem non exercere causa religionis, sed potius antiquae philosophiae consuetudinis.

[3] Characteristic of these times is an anecdote which occurs in the already-mentioned life of Odo. One of the young clergymen of Tournay, who was made uneasy by the controversy between the realist and the nominalist schools, between his teacher Odo and Raimoert of Lisle, applied to a deaf-mute at Tournay, who passed for a soothsayer, to know on which side lay the truth.

dangerous conclusions ascribed to Roscelin's dialectical theory by his theological opponents, had their origin no doubt, in some feeling of this sort.[1] But it does not appear that any such skeptical tendency actually betrayed itself in his theology. We do not perceive that he actually ascribed more to reason in comparison with faith, — that he actually made the latter more dependent on the scrutiny of the former, — than other theologians. He spoke, in fact, not of a *trial* of "faith" by "reason," but of a *defending* of the former by the latter. As pagans and Jews defend their religion, so he maintained ought Christians to defend their religion;[2] and, in order to this, reason should minister to faith. To this, in fact, agreed also the dialectical theologians of the common stamp; nor did it in anywise conflict with the principle of the Augustinian philosophy of religion and doctrine. To be sure, everything depended on the manner according to which the idea of defending the faith should now be determined. Here there was still room for great differences of opinion. The defence of the faith which was held forth as a pretext, might be taken advantage of as a means of entering into a bolder examination of the church doctrines. Although the opposition between Roscelin and the other theologians rested on deeper grounds, yet it was only a subordinate and single point which furnished the occasion for attacking him. As he uniformly maintained that the dialectical exposition of conceptions should be made to subserve the defence of the church doctrines, so he was desirous of showing that, without his nominalism, the doctrine of the Trinity and of the incarnation of the Son of God could not be rightly presented. Considering, as he did, every universal to be a mere abstraction, and particulars as alone having reality, he argued that, if only the essence of God in the Trinity was called *una res*, and the three persons not *tres res*, the latter could not be considered as anything real. Only the one God would be the *real;* all besides, a mere nominal distinction, to which nothing real corresponded; and so, therefore, with the Son would the Father and the Holy Ghost also have become man.

It was accordingly necessary to designate the three persons as three real beings (*tres res*), the same in respect of will and power.[3] Such a view might, not without reason, draw down upon him the reproach of tritheism. At a council assembled in 1093, at Soissons, under the presidency of the archbishop of Rheims, Roscelin's doctrine was condemned as tritheism, and his fears of the wrath of the populace

[1] As when in a letter, not of Abelard's writing, but published in the collection of his works (p. 334), he is accused of doubting the reality of the gospel history, on the ground that such doubt necessarily followed from his principles: "If the conceptions," whole and part, "have no reality, it follows that the testimony of the gospel narrative, 'Christ ate part of a fish roasted on the coals,' cannot be really true," l. c: Hic sicut pseudodialecticus, ita et pseudochristianus, cum in dialectica sua nullam rem partes habere aestimat, ita divinam paginam impudenter pervertit, ut eo loco, quo dicitur Dominus partem piscis assi comedisse, partem hujus vocis, quae est piscis assi, non partem rei, intelligere conatur.

[2] His words in Anselm's book, De fide trinitat. c. iii: Pagani defendunt legem suam, Judaei defendunt legem suam, ergo et nos Christiani debemus defendere fidem nostram.

[3] Anselm. l. c.: Si tres personae sunt una tantum res, et non sunt tres res, unaquaeque per se separatim, sicut tres angeli aut tres animae, ita tamen ut voluntate et potentia omnino sint idem, ergo pater et spiritus sanctus cum filio incarnatus est.

towards him, as a heretic, induced him to a recantation. Thus, driven by the power of his opponents from his native land, he sought in England a place of refuge and field of labor. But he found himself deceived in his expectations; for, on the one hand, he encountered in the archbishop of Canterbury, the primate of the English church, the most zealous champion of realism and opponent of nominalism: while on the other hand, by maintaining a position in no way connected with his peculiar bent, but simply relating to an interest of the church, he incurred the violent displeasure of an important party. He set up the principle anew which had been held at an earlier period by zealots of the school of Hildebrand, and controverted by others, that sons begotten in priestly marriage — which, by the sticklers for the law of celibacy in the priests, was considered, however, a concubinage — should not be admitted to any ecclesiastical office. Now, since it was the case that, until the Hildebrandian principles had worked their way into the whole church, the number of married clergy was still very great, he must necessarily, by maintaining such a principle, excite against himself the hatred of multitudes, partly of sons from such marriages who already stood in some ecclesiastical office, partly of clergymen who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and who were desirous of handing down their office in their families. The anger of these men against him would be so much the greater, because, in such a contest, he could reckon on the support of a party at whose head stood the popes; for which reason the severe censors of morals among the clergy were ever feared and hated. Thus, driven by the wrath of his enemies from England, he returned back to France, where he was destined to engage in new controversies, till at length, wearied with disputing, he withdrew from the public stage, to a life of silent and quiet seclusion.

Roscelin's opponent, Anselm, is the man who exerted the most important influence on the theological and philosophical turn of the twelfth century. He was the Augustin of his age. What gives him his great importance, is that unity of spirit in which everything is of one piece, — the harmony between life and knowledge, which, in his case, nothing disturbed. Love was the inspiring soul of his thought as of his actions. He was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, in 1033. The good seed sown in his tender mind, by his pious mother Ermenberga, seems to have had a singular influence on the development of his powers. Even in childhood he occupied himself in meditation on divine things. Brought up among the mountains, he fancied that heaven was above their peaks, and that there God sat enthroned, surrounded by his court of state. A deep impression was left on his mind by a dream, in which he imagined that he ascended above the mountains to God, and was there refreshed by God's own hands with the bread of heaven. When a young man he was induced, by the morose temper of his father towards him, to leave the paternal roof and travel to France. After having wandered about in that country for the space of nearly three years, attracted by the fame of Lanfranc, he repaired to the monastery of Bec in Normandy,[1] over which that teacher presided,

[1] See vol. iii, p. 506.

and the dialectical bent which his mind here received, determined from that time and forever the course of his inquiries, and of his mode of thinking. In 1060, he became himself a monk in the monastery of Bec; and in 1063, prior of this monastery, as the immediate successor of his teacher, Lanfranc. His time was divided between the common exercises of devotion, the imparting of spiritual counsel, superintending the education of the youth in the monastery, guiding the souls of the monks at large, correcting the ancient manuscripts which had become disfigured with errors through the ignorance of the preceding centuries,[1] and study and meditation on the subject-matter of the Christian faith. Great part of the night was spent by him in these occupations; only a few hours were allowed for sleep. With the station he held in the monastery, were connected a multitude of little duties, unprofitable to the mind;[2] but the self-denial of love enabled him to accomplish all this business with conscientious fidelity; so that the time which he was desirous of devoting to his labors as an author, to study, contemplation, or prayer, had often to be spent in such employments.[3] The man of profound speculative intellect must let himself down — no easy task for him — to the business of teaching boys to decline.[4] He was an enemy to the dark, rigid discipline of the monks. He endeavored to make love the inspiring principle of education. An abbot who enjoyed a high reputation for piety having once complained to him that, with all the strict severity employed in the education of boys, still nothing was brought to pass; that, after all the stripes inflicted on them, they remained incorrigible, utterly stupid, and brutish, — Anselm replied to him: "A beautiful result of your training, to convert men into brutes. But tell me, if you were to plant a tree in your garden, and shut it up on all sides so that its branches could not extend in any direction, what sort of a tree would it become, in case you should, a year afterward, give it freedom again? Certainly, a good-for-nothing tree, with crooked, snarly branches. And would not the whole fault be your own, who forced the tree into such unnatural confinement."[5] This comparison he applied to education after the following manner: "So would it turn out with boys treated with the same severity, irrespective of their several different peculiarities. The evil propensities, restrained by mere force, would only thrive the more in secret; and thus they would grow hardened against everything done for their improvement. Because they experience no love, no act of kindness or friendship, from you, — they give you credit for nothing good, but imagine that all you do proceeds from hatred and malevolence. And because they have been educated

[1] Libros, qui ante id temporis nimis corrupti ubique terrarum erant, corrigebat, says Eadmer, in his life of Anselm.

[2] As he himself expresses it (lib. i, ep. 42): Viles et steriles, quas tamen negligere non audeam, occupationes.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 42: Non solum dictandi, sed et legendi et meditandi sive orandi opportunitatem video remotam.

[4] As he writes to a young monk (l. c. ep. 55): Tu scis, quam molestum mihi semper fuerit pueris declinare.

[5] Itaque indiscrete oppressi, pravas et spinarum more perplexas inter se cogitationes congerunt, fovent, nutriunt, tantaque eas nutriendo vi suffulciunt, ut omnia, quae illorum correctioni possent adminiculari, obstinata mente subterfugiant.

by no one in true love, they can accost no one otherwise than with a cast-down countenance, and stolen glances.[1] And I would fain have you tell me," added he, with some feeling: "Why treat them with such hostility? Are they not human beings: have they not the same nature with yourselves?" He then proceeded to explain how love and severity should be united in the educating of youth. He made the abbot conscious of the evil results which must necessarily follow from his mode of training. What great effects might be brought about by love, Anselm showed by his own example. He found in the monastery a boy by the name of Osbern, who was greatly prejudiced against him, and who possessed a most obstinate temper. But by little acts of kindness, by entering wholly into his peculiar ways, by overlooking many faults, when it could be done without disturbing the order of the monastery, he found means of overcoming, by the force of love, the resistance of an untoward disposition. He enchained the lad to himself, and then first began gradually to pursue with him a more earnest and strict course of discipline. As the boy grew up, a hearty friendship was formed between him and his teacher. Anselm promised himself great things, to be accomplished by his pupil, when a man, in the service of the church. But Osbern fell into a severe fit of sickness. Then Anselm sat continually at the bedside of the beloved youth, nursing him day and night, and furnishing him with every means of spiritual and bodily support. After his death, he took care that, for a year, daily masses should be offered for his soul, and from all to whom he wrote he requested prayers in behalf of his beloved Osbern. On the education of young men generally, he bestowed the greatest care; being convinced that this period of life was best suited to the reception of divine things; that the higher impressions could then be the most easily and durably fixed. As wax, which, when neither too soft nor too hard, most perfectly and clearly gives back the impression of the seal, such was the relation of this age to boyhood on the one hand and more advanced age on the other.[2] He took great pains to excite in his young men an interest in the study of the ancient authors, only admonishing them to avoid everything in them which is obscene.[3]

But his love was shown no less to old age than to youth. He gave a proof of this in the deep interest he took in nursing Herewald, an old man so enfeebled by old age and disease as to be unable to move

[1] Cumque apud nullum fuerint in vera caritate nutriti, nullum nisi depressis superciliis, oculove obliquo valent intueri.

[2] Videas hominem in vanitate hujus saeculi ab infantia usque ad profundam senectutem conversatum, sola terrena sapientem, et in his penitus obduratum, cum hoc age de spiritualibus, huic de subtilitate contemplationis divinae loquere, et perspicies eum nec quid velis quidem posse videre. Nec mirum, indurata cera est. E contrario consideres puerum, aetate ac scientia tenerum, nec bonum nec malum discernere valentem nec te quidem intelligere, de hujusmodi disserentem, nimirum mollis cera est et quasi liquens nec imaginem sigilli quoquomodo recipiens. Medius horum adolescens et juvenis est, ex teneretudine atque duritia congrue temperatus, si hunc instruxeris, ad quae voles, informare valebis.

[3] See his exhortation to a young monk, to read as much as possible, and particularly of those authors which he had not been able to read with him: et praecipue de Virgilio et aliis auctoribus, quos a me non legisti, exceptis his, in quibus aliqua turpitudo sonat. Lib. i, ep. 55.

any member of his body except his tongue. He himself pressed the juice from grapes out of one hand into the other, and gave him to drink of it. After the death of the abbot Herluin, in 1078, Anselm was chosen as his successor; and in this new office also he made the spiritual interest his governing motive. He complained of many abbots, who neglected the spiritual, through an undue attention to the secular affairs of their convents, feeling it incumbent on them to see that nothing was lost of the property consecrated to God, *intrusted to their hands*, but allowing God's law to be obliterated from their hearts: for they were so earnest in being too cunning to be cheated by others, as to become adroit adepts in overreaching others themselves; they were so fearful of any useless expenditure, and of letting anything go without a good reason, that they became covetous, and allowed what they hoarded to rot without being useful to anybody.[1] A still wider field of action was opened to him, when, in 1093, he was called to England as archbishop of Canterbury. Inasmuch as he held it to be his duty, however, to maintain the independence of the church, according to the Hildebrandian principles, he became entangled by means of this high office in violent contests with the kings, William the Second, and Henry the First, which must have been extremely painful to a mind so amiable and so earnestly bent on the quiet of religious meditation. He took refuge with the pope. Urban the Second honored in him at once the dignity of knowledge, and of the office which he held in the church. Three years he spent travelling about without a settled place of abode, in France and Italy. When in the army of the Norman duke, Roger of Sicily, whom he visited at his own request during the siege of Capua, he met among others certain Saracens, who, attracted by the fame of his amiable character, came to visit him. These he entertained in a friendly manner, and won even from them the most unfeigned respect. Soon after his return, in the year 1109, he died, reconciled with all his enemies, and bestowing his blessing on all with his expiring breath.

Thus we see in him a man, whose doctrine and life were in perfect harmony with each other. While love shone eminently forth as the soul of his life, it formed also the central point of his system of faith and morals, as appears evident in that remarkable saying of his, that "if he had presented before him the hatefulness of sin on the one side, and the torments of hell on the other, and were left to take his choice between the two, he would prefer to be pure from sin, and innocent in hell, rather than to be polluted with sin, and happy in heaven." Doubtless, in so saying, he was aware that he supposed what would be impossible. By this language, he simply contradicted the sensuous and fleshly externalized notions of hell and of heaven. By the manner in which he felt himself constrained to decide in the choice between

[1] His words: Sunt multi praelati nostri ordinis, qui quasi solliciti, ne destruantur res Dei in manibus eorum, agunt, ut dissipetur lex Dei in cordibus eorum, nam tantum conantur esse prudentes, ne decipiantur ab aliis, ut fiant astuti, ad decipiendum alios. Adeo sunt cauti, ne fiant prodigi et quae habent irrationabiliter perdant, ut avari fiant et quae servant, inutiliter putrescant. Lib. ii, ep. 71.

two impossible suppositions, he simply marked the necessary inner connection between sin and hell, and between holiness and heaven; he simply pointed at that which forms the peculiar ground of Christian hope in its essential inner bond of union with Christian love.[1] "To love others," said he, "is better than to receive proofs of love from others, for all gifts of love are of a perishable nature, but love itself is eternal, and in itself well pleasing to God."[2] He ever represented the disposition of love as that which alone gave their true worth to all Christian doing and suffering; so that according to the measure of this, was to be estimated the value of all good works, and of all renunciations, as he distinctly remarks in one of his letters.[3] "I have learned in the school of Christ, that whoever, from true love to God, and to his neighbor, gives to him that needs, were it but a cup of cold water, or an alms, shall not lose his reward. The greater the love to God, and to his neighbor, which prompts a monk to deny himself the food set before him, the greater is the alms which he gives, and the greater the reward which he reaps." On his own person, he practised the most rigid abstinence. He restricted, in every way, his sensual wants, so that his friends entertained fears for his health; and love set them on inventing many little expedients by which to compel him to relax the severity of his self-discipline.[4] Even amid the splendor of the highest dignity in the English church, he preserved the rigid abstinence of the monk. We know this from a remarkable and characteristic incident, which at the same time evidences the force of love with which he bound others to his person. Queen Matilda of England, who clung to him with the deepest affection and reverence, as her ghostly father, was filled with great anxiety for him, when she had heard that, after long fasting, he was accustomed to take food, not from his own sense of hunger, but only by being reminded of it by his servant. She therefore wrote him a letter,[5] in which she begged him, in the most touching manner, for the sake of his community, to be more indulgent to himself, lest by the severity of his abstinence he should lose the strength of his voice and thereby diminish his usefulness as a preacher, at least so far as not to be distinctly heard by those standing at a distance.[6] She brought up the example of Christ, who, by attending banquets as well as fasts, had sanctified eating.[7] Anselm replied to her, that although he could fast without being pained by hunger, yet he could

[1] This idea lies at the ground of the language which he employed to explain his meaning, when the above-mentioned saying excited surprise. Cum constet, solos malos in inferno torqueri, et solos bonos in coelesti regno foveri, patet, nec bonos in inferno, si illuc intrarent, posse teneri debita poena malorum, nec malos in coelo, si forte accederent, frui valere felicitate bonorum.

[2] Eadmer's Account of his life, c. v, § 41.

[3] Lib. i, ep. 41.

[4] Eadmer relates, that only when engaged, while he was eating, in the discussion of some theological subject, he would, without thinking of it, take more food than usual. and the one who sat next to him took this opportunity to slip more bread before him.

[5] Lib. iii, ep. 56.

[6] Ne vox spiritualium aedificatrix raucescat et quae canonum ac dulce Dei verbum decoro, quieto remissoque sermone dispensare consueverat, id tanto remissius in futurum exequatur, ut quosque ali quantisper a te remotiores audientia ipsius voce privatos fructu etiam vacuos derelinquat. Nolite igitur, bone pater et sancte, nolite tam intempestive corporis viribus inedia destitui, ne orator esse desistatis.

[7] Christus Jesus, qui dedicavit jejunium, dedicavit et esum, vadens ad convivium nuptiarum.

and would, so far as it might be necessary and useful, strengthen his body by suitable nourishment.[1]

Severe as he was, however, towards himself, he was none the less indulgent towards others; and it gave him pain to see any one refrain from satisfying his hunger, out of any respect to himself. He looked with a friendly eye on those who ate at his own board, when they seemed to relish their food; he elevated his hand over them and gave them his blessing, saying, "May it do you much good." He uniformly valued the spirit above the letter, and never scrupled to abate somewhat from the severity of the monastic rule, to sacrifice somewhat of the letter, whenever the spirit seemed to require it, whenever that charity which would avoid every occasion of giving pain to others, counselled him thereto. In the passage where this fact is stated by Anselm's disciple, the monk Eadmer, who wrote the account of his life, we recognize the spirit of his master, in his manner of defending this conduct against the censures he had drawn upon himself by such departures from the common usage, when he says that whoever enjoyed the good fortune of really understanding the life of Anselm, would consider it a thing far more deserving of praise, that occasionally, for good reasons, he relaxed somewhat from the severity of his habits of life, than if he had always stiffly adhered to them; for virtuous conduct consisted in acting rationally.[2]

One of those recluses who had so many opportunities of scattering among the crowds that flocked to visit them the word of exhortation, had begged him to give him some instructions as to the best manner of proceeding, in order to excite the laity who visited him to contempt of earthly things and longing after the kingdom of heaven. He drew up for him the following sketch: "My dear brother, God calls and asks you to bid for the kingdom of heaven. This kingdom of heaven is one whose blessedness and glory no mortal eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, and no heart of man can conceive. But that thou mayest gain some idea of it, take the following illustration. Whatever any one who is thought worthy of reigning there *wills*, that, whether in heaven or on earth, *is done;* and whatever he does *not* will, is *not* done. For so great will be the love between God and those who are to be in this kingdom, — and of the latter, one towards the other, — that all will love each other as they do themselves, and God more than they do themselves. Hence, no one there will be disposed to will anything else than what God wills, and what one wills all shall will, and what one or all may will, God shall will. It will therefore be with every individual and with all, with the whole creation and with God himself, as each shall will. And thus shall all be perfect kings; for that *shall be* which each *wills;* and all will be at the same time with God as one king, as it were one man, because all shall will

[1] Licet sic possim sine famis molestia jejunare, satis tamen possum et volo, cum debeo, quantum expedit, corpus alimentis recreare.

[2] Nos, qui vitae illius modum scire meruimus, magis in eo laudandum aestimamus, quod a rigore sui propositi aliquando pro ratione descendebat, quam si continue in ipso rigidus indiscrete persisteret. Ratione siquidem agi virtutis est, vitii vero contra.

the same thing, and what they will shall *be*. God from heaven asks you to bid for such a good. Does any one inquire, for what price? He is answered, He who will give the kingdom of heaven, demands no earthly price; and to God, to whom belongs everything that exists, no one can give what he had not. And yet God does not give so great a good for nothing; for he gives it to none who do not love it; for no one gives that which he dearly values to him that cares nothing about it. Therefore *love* and *possess*. Finally, since to reign in heaven, is nothing else than to be so united by love into one will with God, all holy angels and men, as that all at the same time possess the same power, love God more than thyself, and thou beginnest already to possess what there thou wilt have in a perfect manner. But this love cannot be a perfect one in thee, unless thou makest thy heart free from all other love; for, like a vase which, the more you fill it with water or with any other fluid, will hold so much the less oil, so the heart excludes *this* love in the same proportion as it is carried away by some other love." Anselm was of a predominantly contemplative nature; yet he devoted himself, unsparingly, to the public and outward duties to which he was called by his different fields of action.

Love formed, with him, the bond of union between the contemplative and the practical life. A distinguishing trait in his character was this inward placidity of mind, so well suited to religious meditation and speculation, which he never suffered to be disturbed by the multitude of cares that pressed upon him from without. In the midst of his business affairs, of his contests, and of his journeys, those speculative questions were ever thronging before his mind, which he sought to answer in the writings composed by him. What makes an important difference between Anselm and others, who passed over from simple, childlike faith to speculation, is this; it was not, as in the case of others, the conflict of the flesh with the spirit, the reaction of natural reason against divine things, — not the stimulus of doubt, which incited him to speculation on the object-matter of faith. He was not seeking, by dint of thought, to find his way out from an inward schism to regain the lost certainty and repose of faith. The object-matter of Christian faith was, to him, immediately certain; his Christian consciousness was raised above all doubt. The experience of the heart was, to him, the surest evidence of the reality of that which faith guaranteed to him. But then, inasmuch as, with his sincere and undoubting faith, he united a mind profoundly inquisitive and speculative, and the latter too asserted its proper rights, he was convinced that that which approved itself to him as the highest matter in faith and in the experience of the heart, must also approve itself as such for thought; that there is no schism in the spirit; that that which, as the image of God, distinguishes man from the rest of creation, could not remain alien from the divine object-matter. Accordingly, he felt constrained to account to himself by a rational knowledge for that which, in itself, was to him the most certain of all things. Two remarkable[1] examples may serve to illustrate

[1] The intimate connection between these two in Anselm, is admirably described by

this connection in the life of his spirit. It was while he was still prior in the monastery of Bec, that, awakened just before matins, from sleep, he reclined on his bed, meditating how it was to be conceived that the prophets had viewed the past and the future, at once, as something present. And while absorbed in these thoughts, he sat, with his eyes fixed on the ground, he saw, directly through the wall, the monks, whose allotted business it was, passing about in the church, going up to the altar, putting everything in order for the mass, lighting the candles, and at length one of them ringing the bell to awaken the rest. When, at the sound of the bell, all the monks now rose from their beds and assembled together, Anselm was filled with amazement, and saw that it was the easiest thing for God to reveal the future, in the minds of the prophets, when he had enabled him to behold with his eyes, through so many thick partitions, what was going on in the church.[1] Now whether we look upon this undeniably singular fact as the coincidence of a vision presented to the imagination with things that actually occurred outwardly, or as a real beholding, not confined by spatial limitations, and proceeding from some inner sensorium at the foundation of the organs of outward sense, similar to what is affirmed of the somnambulist states,— this psychological phenomenon, whatever we may think of it, manifestly furnished Anselm an analogy by which to explain the prophetic intuition. The idea lying at bottom is, that, as in the appearance in question, the separating interval of space was, for this intuition, annihilated, so the separating intervals of time are removed for the intuition of the prophets.

The second example is as follows: On a certain occasion, when Anselm was profoundly reflecting how everything that belongs to the doctrine concerning God, his essence, and his attributes, might be summed up and comprehended in one brief argument,[2] — the thought haunted him everywhere, so that he could neither eat nor sleep quietly. Even his devotions at matins, and other seasons of church-worship, were thereby disturbed. Already, he was on the point of repelling all these thoughts, as a temptation of Satan. But the more he struggled against them, the more importunately they thronged in upon his mind. And one night, during the celebration of vigils, his thoughts all at once became clear; his heart swelled with delight, and he immediately recorded the train of reflection which had given him this high satisfaction, — and this was the origin of his Proslogion. Thus were the religious and speculative bents, in his case, united together; and the works, from which his mind derived all its nourishment, and which, as he continually studied them, gave the impulse to all his inquiries, were the Bible and St. Augustin.[3] Thus too in his contro-

Eadmer: Divinis scripturis tantam fidem adhibebat, ut indissolubili firmitate cordis crederet, nihil in eis esse, quod solidae veritatis tramitem ullo modo exiret. Quapropter (therefore this firmness of conviction was the basis of his thinking) summo studio animum ad hoc intenderat, quatenus juxta fidem suam mentis ratione mererertur percipere, quae in ipsis sensit multa caligine tecta latere.

[1] Eadmer, ii, 9.

[2] The ontological proof, hereafter to be mentioned.

[3] Eadmer, i, 68: Nihil asserere, nisi quod aut canonicis aut Augustini dictis incunctanter posse defendi videret.

versy with Roscelin, the philosophical and theological interests were most closely united. Nominalism appeared to him as a mode of thinking which was utterly without power to rise above the things of sense; which did not allow reason to come round to itself,— to the consciousness of its own peculiar essence, — which, by refusing to acknowledge the reality of ideas, made all knowledge impossible. "Reason," says he, concerning the Nominalists, "which should rule and direct over everything in man, is with them so beclouded by images of sense, that they cannot extricate themselves from their fetters, and look away from them to that which reason should contemplate alone, and purely in her own spiritual essence."[1] The Christian ground-doctrine, of the incarnation of God, seems to him to be one incompatible with nominalism: "For," says he, "how can one who occupies this position, conceive a union of God with human nature? If there are no persons at all except human persons, the conception of human nature, of humanity, is destitute of all reality."[2]

It is plain, we allow, from what has been said, how very much the tranquil course of religious and theological development in Anselm differed from that of Augustin, which passed through so many stormy trials; but both were led, by different ways, to the same result, that the right understanding of the truths of faith can proceed only from Christian consciousness,— presupposes faith and inward experience. The Augustinian principle, respecting the relation of the scientific system of doctrines to faith, "*fides praecedit intellectum*," was accordingly also Anselm's, and by his means first brought over into the medieval theology. He unfolded and defended it in his controversy with Roscelin, although the latter had, properly speaking, offered nothing against it. Anselm, like others, seized hold of the words in Isaiah 7: 9,— understood according to the translation of the Vulgate, — which had been employed from very early times as a classical proof-passage on this point. "Every Christian," says he, "must ever hold fast the same faith *without doubting;* and while he loves it, and lives according to it, seek humbly to discover, so far as he may be able, the reasons why it is so.[3] If he is able to understand them, let him give God thanks. If he is not able, let him bow his head in reverence; for self-confident human wisdom will sooner break its own horn than succeed in overturning this rock." He rebukes those who boldly start the highest questions respecting the faith, before they have obtained from faith the wings of the mind. Their errors he attributes directly to the inverted method which they pursued in their investigations; to the fact that they were for having the *intellectus* precede the

[1] De fide trinitatis, c. ii: Prorsus a spiritualium quaestionum disputatione sunt exsufflandi. In eorum quippe animabus ratio, quae et princeps et judex omnino omnium debet esse, quae sunt in homine, sic est imaginibus corporalibus obvoluta, ut ex eis se non possit evolvere nec ab ipsis ea, quae ipsa sola et pura contemplari debet, valeat discernere.

[2] Qui non potest intelligere, aliquid esse hominem, nisi individuum, nullatenus intelliget, hominem assumptum esse a verbo, non personam, id est aliam naturam, non aliam personam esse assumptam?

[3] Semper eandem fidem indubitanter tenendo, amando et secundum illam vivendo, humiliter, quantum potest, quaerere rationem, quomodo sit.

fides. When such persons were inclined to dispute on matters of which they had had no experience, Anselm said, it was as if a bat, or a nocturnal owl — creatures that can see the heavens only by night — should contend respecting the beams of the sun, at noonday, with eagles, that gaze directly at the sun himself. "First, then, the heart must be purified by faith; the eyes must be enlightened by observing the commandments of the Lord. We must become children, in humble obedience to the divine word, before we can understand the wisdom which God has hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes. We must first renounce the flesh, and live after the Spirit, before we may venture to investigate the deep things of faith; for the natural man has no perception of divine things. The more we practise, in active obedience, that which the Holy Scriptures teach us for practical living, and so nourish ourselves, the greater shall be our progress in that which gives satisfaction to the cravings of the mind after knowledge. He who believes not, will not experience; and he who has not experienced, will not understand; for, as high as actual experience is above the mere hearing of a thing, so high is *his* knowledge who has the experience of faith above his who barely knows by report. The practical is so closely connected with the theoretical, that not only can no one rise to a higher stage of knowledge without faith, and keeping the divine commandments,— but, sometimes, the very understanding bestowed is withdrawn, and faith itself destroyed, because a good conscience has been neglected." Anselm refers here to what St. Paul says, in the first chapter of Romans, respecting such as did not like to retain God in their knowledge.

His theology pursues, therefore, the two directions; first, of defending the independence of faith, and its inviolable dignity, against a proud — or, what at least seems to him a proud — spirit of dialectical speculation; and, secondly, of pointing out the rational mode of apprehending and unfolding the truths of faith, and showing their agreement with divinely enlightened reason. In Anselm, we find heart and reason, feelings and knowledge, the mystical and the speculative elements, beautifully united. The substance and matter of his faith was that given him by the tradition of the church; but his own subjective life of faith had developed itself in the study of the sacred writings. Since that which pertains to the church, and that which pertains to Christianity, were in his mind intimately fused together from the first, since with this spiritual bent he *read* and *lived* himself into the sacred Scriptures, he involuntarily moulded everything he derived from them into the Catholic form. To profoundness of feeling and thought he united acuteness of understanding; yet, in him, profound thought predominated above acuteness, and the religious interest was everywhere the ruling one. Accordingly, it might easily come about that into the formal argument, which, on independent examination, might fail to satisfy the demands of the logician, he would unconsciously introduce matter derived from the depths of his religious consciousness, and so fancy that he had demonstrated what he was certain of prior to all proof, and what otherwise could not by such

demonstration become matter of conviction. Often must we distinguish, in his case, between the profound ideas lying at bottom, and the faulty syllogistic form of their setting forth.

Thus, in Anselm, we see the different main directions of the spirit that actuated his times harmoniously combined. But the spiritual elements that were blended together in him became separated in the progress of the spiritual life of this period, and proceeded to antagonisms which belong amongst the most significant appearances of the twelfth century. Controversies arose which were at first necessary, in order to conduct the unfolding process of theology to its decision. In particular, the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, and Abelard, in the beginning of the twelfth century, appear to us as the representatives of the two main theological directions that started forth from the unity in which they had been combined in Anselm one, issuing from the life of feeling, the practico-mystical; the other the dialectical tendency.

In the first place, as it respects Bernard, it will be necessary here to refer back, to what we observed in the history of monasticism, concerning his religious position. We saw that the experience of the heart, growing out of faith, was with him the main thing; that he allowed that sort of knowledge in religion alone to be the right one, which leads man back into the recesses of his own heart, and teaches him to be humble. The man, whose entire life belonged to monasticism, and that mode of intuition which lies at the bottom of it,— contemplating the matter from this point of view,— did not consider the highest aim of the Christian life as genuine Christianity required that he should do,— the humanization of the divine, the ennobling of all that is human by a divine principle of life,— but a stage of Christian perfection above the purely human; a soaring upward of the contemplative spirit, that leaves all that is human behind it. The highest, to his apprehension, is not that which is to be reached by the harmonious development of all the powers of man's nature; but it is the rapture of inspiration, which, overleaping all intermediate stages, antedates the intuition of the life eternal. "The greatest man," says Bernard, "is he, who despising the use of things and of sense,— so far as human frailty may be permitted to do so,— not by a slowly ascending progression, but by a sudden spring, is sometimes wont to reach in contemplation those lofty heights."[1] To this kind he reckons the account of St. Paul, how he was caught up to the third heaven.[2] He distinguishes three different stages, or positions: "That of a practically pious life, maintained amidst the relations of civil society, where sense and the things of sense are used in a sober and orderly manner, according to the will of God; second, where one rises by a gradually progressive knowledge from the revelation of God's invisible essence,

[1] Omnino maximus, qui spreto ipso usu rerum et sensuum, quantum quidem humanae fragilitati fas est, non ascensoriis gradibus, sed inopinatis excessibus avolare interdum contemplando ad illa sublimia consuevit. De consideratione, lib. v, c. i, § 3.

[2] Excessus, non ascensus, nam raptum potius fuisse, quam ascendisse, ipse se perhibet.

in creation, to that essence itself; third, and highest, where the spirit collects its energies within itself, and, so far as it is divinely sustained, divests itself of things human, to rise to the contemplation of God.[1] At this last stage, the man attains immediately to that which is the aim of all aims, the experience of the divine. To the same point, the other two stages also tend, but by a longer way. That which is highest, cannot be taught by words, but only revealed through the Spirit. No language can explain it; but we may by prayer and purity of heart attain to it, after we have prepared ourselves for it by a worthy life."

Again, he compares together the three different relations of the mind to the knowledge of religious truth, expressed by opinion, faith, and intellectual apprehension (*opinio*, *fides*, *intellectus*). "Intellectual apprehension" proceeds from rational knowledge; faith reposes on authority; opinion holds only to the probable. The two former are in possession of the truth, but in different ways; faith possesses the truth, but enveloped and hid under a veil; intellect possesses it unveiled, and revealed. It is especially important to distinguish these three operations of the mind, and to hold them to their respective provinces; to take care that faith does not seize, as a matter of certainty, upon what belongs to bare opinion; or that opinion does not call in question the settled convictions of faith. If opinion affirms with authority, it is presumptuous. If faith companies with doubt, it is weak. If intellection attempts to force open the sealed treasure of faith, it is wanton self-will rebelling against the majesty of the divine. Faith is a sure prelibation of truth, as yet not made clear,— a foretaste, growing out of the bent of the will.[2] The following characters, or marks, therefore, are brought together in faith: the bent of the will, whereby conviction is determined; practical appropriation of the truth; living fellowship with divine things, which are still hidden from knowledge. Conviction here is not determined by outward reasons, as in the case of knowledge; it proceeds from something subjective, from a bent of the disposition towards the divine; and the conviction which proceeds from this source is a sure one. Intellection is a certain and clear knowledge of the invisible. The difference, therefore, between intellection and faith, is not constituted by the degree of certainty, but by the degree of clearness; that being wrapped up in faith which is unfolded to intellection.[3] "There is nothing we long to know, more than that which we already know by faith; therefore we desire that, to the certainty already given in faith, should be added the clearness of knowledge. To our blessedness nothing more will be wanting, when that which is already certain to us by faith shall also be seen by us without

[1] Dispensativa est consideratio, sensibus sensibilibusque rebus ordinate et socialiter utens ad promerendum Deum. Aestimativa est consideratio prudenter ac diligenter quaeque scrutans ac ponderans ad vestigandum Deum. Speculativa est consideratio se in se colligens et, quantum divinitus adjuvatur, rebus humanis eximens ad contemplandum Deum.

[2] Voluntaria quaedam et certa praeliba tio necdum propalatae veritatis.

[3] Quod etsi non habet incertum, non magis quam intellectus, habet tamen involucrum, quod non intellectus.

a vail."[1] It would therefore be doing Bernard injustice to assert that he altogether discarded the striving after knowledge, that he was a stranger to all such longings of the mind. The satisfaction of this need, implanted in the mind, he reckoned in fact among the things that constitute the blessedness of the eternal life; nor would he banish such a striving even from the condition of the present life, although he himself was more inclined to that contemplation which is fed from the heart. But a striving, not conscious of its proper limits, not respecting the sacred precincts of faith, violating the simplicity and humility of faith and the warmth of feeling, the striving of speculation, was hateful to him. Had speculative theology ever marched onward in the path marked out by Anselm, Bernard could easily have come to an understanding with it; and, although his own path was a different one, yet have entertained friendly feelings towards it. But the case was altered by the bold appearance of Abelard.

Peter Abelard, born 1079, at Palais, not far from Nantes in Bretany, was already in the first years of his youth seized with an enthusiasm for those dialectical studies. He was endowed with splendid natural gifts; but he was perhaps too conscious also of this fact.[2] A too intense feeling of self, that constantly received fresh nourishment from the brilliant recognition which his talents soon met with, was the moral failing which, from the outset to the evening of his life, he had especially to contend against, and which contributed to involve him in those strong trials that finally reacted to chastise and purify his heart. He soon fell into controversy with his teachers; for example, with that renowned dialectician, master of a realistic school, William de Champeaux of Paris. In Melun, Corbeil, Paris, he acquired, by his proficiency in dialectics, a great name and much approbation. From the study of philosophy, he was desirous of passing over to theology; although he was still far from possessing that disposition of heart without which such studies cannot be successfully prosecuted. He went to Laon, to hear Anselm, then a famous teacher; but not finding himself satisfied with his teachings, soon had the boldness to stand forth as teacher himself, in rivalship with his master. Driven thence, he betook himself to Paris; and there, by his philosophical and theological lectures, he created a great sensation. From Rome, Italy, all parts of France, the Netherlands, Germany, young men flocked to hear him. His fame and plentiful income tempted him to remit more and more a proper watchfulness over himself, so that he gradually let drop the reins and abandoned himself to his pleasures.[3] He himself afterwards

[1] Nil autem malumus scire, quam quae fide jam scimus. Nil supererit ad beatitudinem, cum, quae jam certa sunt nobis fide, erunt aeque et nuda.

[2] In a work written in a later period of his life, after his various misfortunes, he says of himself: Confido in ea, quae mihi largior est, ingenii abundantia, ipso cooperante scientiarum dispensatore, non pauciora me praestiturum eloquentiae peripateticae munimenta, quam illi praestiterunt, quos Latinorum celebrat studiosa doctrina. Dialectica ed. Cousin, p. 228.

[3] Abelard says of himself, in his Historia calamitatum: Cum jam me solum in mundo superesse philosophum aestimarem, nec ullam ulterius inquietationem formidarem, frena libidini coepi laxare, qui antea vixeram continentissime. Et quo amplius in philosophia vel sacra lectione profeceram, amplius a philosophis et divinis immunditia vitae recedebam.

recognized, in the misfortunes which he thus brought upon himself, the means appointed by divine providence for removing the moral disorders of his life, among which he names in particular pride and luxury.[1] The outrageous inflictions he suffered, induced him to withdraw from the world, and in the year 1119 he entered, as monk, the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris. Here he was importunately beset with petitions, from many of his earlier disciples and other young clergymen, to recommence, in a new sense and spirit, and for the glory of God, those courses of lectures, which he had formerly given for the purpose of gaining money and a name. The monks of St. Denis, with their licentious manners, rejoiced at any opportunity of getting rid of a severe and bitter censor, and were therefore extremely urgent that he should follow this invitation. A priory belonging to this abbey, and bordering on the province of count Theobald of Champagne, was given up to him for this object: and soon he became, once more, the centre of attraction for the youth, who flocked from all quarters to his lectures, so that neither rooms nor means of subsistence sufficed for their accommodation.[2] It is true, he still continued to busy himself here also with the explanation of ancient authors, and the resolution of dialectic questions; but the new and more serious turn which misfortune had given to his mind, induced him to direct his attention more particularly to theological subjects, which he treated according to his own peculiar dialectical method.

In compliance with the wishes of his auditors, he commenced embodying his theological doctrines in a work, in which, doubtless, he intended to embrace the whole system of faith, but which did not extend beyond the doctrine of the trinity; *Theologia*, or *Introductio in Theologiam*.[3] From this work, it appears evident that a controversy had already broken out between the dialectical and the practical church party. Abelard writes, not without a certain degree of excitement, against the antagonists of the new dialectical method. He makes it a matter of complaint, that so many, who had no conception of a rational exposition of the doctrines of faith, sought to console themselves for their inaptitude by extolling in the highest terms that glowing zeal of faith, by virtue of which one believes without inquiry or examination.[4] He describes them, therefore, as the advocates of a blind belief on mere authority. He says, in opposition to such, that, in following their notions, no means would be left to refute the followers of a false religion and to reclaim them from their errors. All

[1] Cum igitur totus in superbia atque luxuria laborarem, utriusque morbi remedium divina mihi gratia, licet nolenti, contulit.

[2] He himself, in giving the history of his misfortune, remarks with regard to his lectures what certainly we have no reason to consider as exaggerated: Ad quas tanta scholarium multitudo confluxit, ut nec locus hospitiis nec terra sufficeret alimentis.

[3] In his preface, he even uses the expression: Sacrae eruditionis summa quasi divinae scripturae introductio.

[4] Nunc plurimi solatium suae imperitiae quaerunt, ut cum ea de fide docere nituntur, quae ut etiam intelligi possint, disserere non sufficiunt, illum maxime fidei fervorem commendent, qui ea quae dicantur, antequam intelligat, credit, et prius his assentit ac recipit, quam quae ipsa sint videat et, an recipienda sint, agnoscat seu pro captu suo discutiat. Lib. ii, p. 1061.

idolaters, too, might plant themselves on the same principle.[1] If this party affirmed that the truths God had revealed could not be understood in the present life, this would lead to Montanism: it would follow from it, that the sacred authors had been blind instruments of the Holy Spirit, and did not themselves understand what they wrote. A faith that sprung up so easily, that was not the result of examination, could never possess firmness. He appealed to the words of Sirach, 19: 4: "He who believes soon, is fickle-minded." Men who are not of easy faith, require reasons, that may determine them to believe; either rational arguments or facts. Thus Thomas, Paul, were led to the faith by facts; and the greater the difficulty which Paul encountered in making his way to the faith, the stronger his faith proved to be after his conversion." He argued, that this apostle preferred the gift of prophecy above all other gifts of the Spirit, because it enabled him to expound that which is contained in the collective matter of religious consciousness, in a way calculated to convince others; and undervalued the gift of tongues, because the former faculty was not connected with it.[2]

He distinguished different stages in the growth and development of faith. In the way just described, arises only the first degree of faith, religious conviction, determined by the force of rational arguments or of objective facts. This is, as yet, no such faith as has merit in the sight of God. From this is developed, by the superventtion of love, a faith which, without allowing itself to be led astray by outward appearances, recognizes something as indisputably true, on account of God's word; where the love that trusts in God requires no other reason; as in the case of Abraham's faith.[3] But the first mentioned faith is only a preparatory step, though not on that account to be despised. Abelard, accordingly, supposes the following process of development. "One first inquires into the reasons, which show the truth of Christianity; thus, faith obtains its warrant. Out of this proceeds next, by the power of the Holy Spirit, the confidence of religious conviction in reference to things unseen. Faith ever has reference to the invisible things of God. The visible and sensuous may furnish a foothold or occasion for faith, an outward vehicle, whereby that which is the object of faith manifests itself to the mind; but not the object of faith itself. Even Thomas, to whom our Lord said, 'thou believest because thou hast seen,' did not believe on that which he saw. He *saw* the sensible appearance, and he *believed* only in God, concealed under the same."[4]

[1] Cujusque populi fides, quantamcunque astruat falsitatem, refelli non poterit. Respondere poterit, secundum nos ipsos etiam de fide ratiocinandum non esse, nec a nobis alios impeti debere, unde nos ab aliis censemus impetendos non esse. Lib. ii, p. 1059.

[2] Thus he explains the prophetari: Ea quae dicuntur exponere et eorum intelligentiam aperire. L. c. p. 1062.

[3] Distinguitur itaque fides talis a fide Abrahae, qui contra spem in spem credidit, nec naturae possibilitatem, sed promittentis attendit veritatem. Lib. ii, p. 1060.

[4] If Abelard (lib. ii, p. 1061) called faith, as compared to intuition (ipsarum rerum experientia per ipsam earum praesentiam = cognitio), simply in this relation, the existimatio non apparentium, an explanation which was interpreted so much to his discredit, yet he in nowise intended by this to put faith on a level with other mere

Among the germs of a new theological development, which Abelard only failed to prosecute far enough, and take advantage of, belongs this also, that, in allotting to faith its peculiar province and determining its limits, he separated from it things that concerned not the religious interest, things that to this were a matter of indifference; as, for example, the question whether Christ was a man of this or that stature, whether he had preached in this or that city:[1] a distinction which might have led him still farther to separate that which is properly an article of faith from that which is not such, but belongs to the same class with other historical facts; and in the sacred Scriptures themselves, to separate that which is properly the word of God, from that which is not such; and we may actually find, in Abelard, the indications of a freer mode of apprehending the idea of inspiration. In connection with this particular, must be taken also a remark of his, in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, that perhaps what the gospel has taught concerning faith, hope, and charity might suffice for salvation."[2]

Lying at the basis of all Abelard's teachings, is the distinction which he makes between religion in itself, that has its root in the heart, — the substance of faith in itself, and the knowledge thence derived, the development of that which is given in immediate consciousness, under the form of knowledge. Therefore, he employs in defence of the dialectic science, an argument of the same sort as the Alexandrian church-teachers had employed before him, that, although nothing is gained by that science for faith in itself, yet thereby the faculty is acquired of unfolding and vindicating scientifically the truths of faith. Two individuals may be equal as to the strength of their faith and piety; and still, on the side of Christian knowledge, one may be eminently superior to the other, because he is enabled, by his earlier scientific culture, to present the common object-matter of Christian faith in a scientific form. Piety, without scientific study, can here avail nothing. He was wont, for illustration, to compare Paul and Augustin on the one hand, with Peter and Martin of Tours on the other. The two former have no advantage, in respect of piety, over the two latter; yet they are as distinguished from them in point of knowledge, as we might be led to suppose they would be, from their earlier scientific education.[3] These remarks of Abelard are grounded on a mode of

fancies and opinions, or to disparage its worth. At the same time, he made it prominent, that faith is the substantia rerum non apparentium, which, in the Sentences, soon to be more particularly described, ed. Rheinwald, c. ii (which section on faith corresponds in all respects with the Introduct. theol. p. 980), he thus explains: Fundamentum et origo, unde ad speranda aliqua perducimur, credendo scilicet primum ea esse, ut postmodum speremus. Argumentum non apparentium, hoc est probatio, quod sint aliqua non apparentia.

[1] Sunt autem plura ad Deum pertinentia, quae credi vel non credi nostra non interest, quia sive credantur sive non credantur nullum incurrimus periculum. (The examples are taken from the Sentences.)

[2] Lib. i, p. 493: Sufficere saluti fortasse poterant ea, quae evangelium de fide et spe et caritate tradiderat. Which assertion he contrived, however, to reconcile with the church doctrine, assuming that our Lord had reserved many things to be arranged and ordered by the apostles and later fathers, which, after having been once ordained, could not be disregarded without peril to salvation.

[3] Paulus quippe Apostolus licet non major merito quam Petrus videatur, vel con-

apprehending the idea of inspiration somewhat different from the one common at that time, on a habit of distinguishing the divine and the human elements in inspiration; for it follows, indeed, from this, that the different ways in which Peter and Paul present divine truth, are to be ascribed, not so much to a divine causalty, as to the difference of their human individuality, and of their human education. It is evident, what a germ was herein contained of a quite different view of the Bible, of quite different principles of biblical interpretation, from any which then prevailed. Abelard, certainly, was not aware of all the wide differences here involved; but we shall see, however, that he did consciously give another shaping to the idea of inspiration.

Furthermore, he held that, in defending divine truth against those who attacked it with the weapons of worldly science, it was absolutely necessary to place one's self at their position, and to become acquainted with and apply the arts which they made use of.[1] We should carefully distinguish, in worldly science, that which is God's gift in it, from that which arises from man's abuse of it. "Far be it from us to believe that God, who makes use of evil itself to promote good, should not also so order all the arts which are his gifts, that they too may subserve his glory, however much they may be perverted by bad men."[2] Upon this principle, the connection between God's work and human culture should be recognized even in the church-teachers and apostles themselves.[3] When Paul says, "knowledge puffeth up," the very remark presupposes that it is something good in itself; for pride fixes upon that which, in itself considered, is good. Still, Abelard by no means felt himself bound to give a complete demonstration and a complete knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity. He distinguishes between intellection (the *intelligere*), which corresponds to the position of faith, and cognition (the *cognoscere*), or the full intuition of the life eternal.[4] And he expressly declared: "We do not promise, on this point, to teach the truth, — a task to which we hold that neither ourselves, nor any other mortal, is competent; but we promise to teach at least something *probable*, something which approximates near to human reason, and which stands in no contradiction with our holy faith."[5]

He was as far removed as possible from that rationalist view which denies miracles. He defended the idea of the supernatural against an arrogant philosophy; and we shall hereafter be led to see the connection between his view of miracles and his doctrine concerning almighty

fessor Augustinus quam Martinus, tanto tamen uterque altero majorem in doctrina gratiam post conversionem habuit, quanto antea majore literarum scientia pollebat. Lib. ii, p. 1053.

[1] Alio modo non possumus, nisi has quas noverunt rationes, ex ipsorum artibus afferamus. Lib. ii, p. 1047.

[2] Absit enim hoc, ut credamus Deum, qui malis quoque ipsis bene utitur, non bene etiam omnes artes, quae ejus dona sunt, ordinare, ut haec quoque ejus majestati deserviant, quantumcunque male his abutuntur perversi.

[3] Ne a donis ejus alienae viderentur sacculares literae, si ad nullum eis commodum uteretur. Lib. ii, p. 1053.

[4] In opposition to those who maintained that the perfect knowledge of the Trinity was reserved to the life eternal, Abelard says, l. c. p. 1061: Profecto aliud est intelligere seu credere, aliud cognoscere seu manifestare, cognitio, that is, ipsarum rerum experientia per ipsam earum prae sentiam.

[5] L. c. 1047.

power, and the creation and government of the world. His tendency and his principles led him only so far as to combat the supernaturalism which affirmed an absolute antagonism between the supernatural and the natural, and to demonstrate the harmonious connection between the two. From this harmonious agreement between the supernatural and the natural, showing the work of one God in original creation and in the kingdom of grace, he proceeded, as a starting-point, to justify the employment of the worldly sciences for the defence of Christianity and of its doctrines; saying of the opponents against whom he had to contend, "that they treated the matter as if God's works of creation stood in contradiction with divine revelation and the truths of faith."[1] He maintained, on the contrary, that men were bound to seek the analogies of things supernatural, by tracing out the connection of all God's works in nature. In this view, he found a reason for the frequent use of parables in the Bible, — God taking similitudes from the kingdom of nature for the representation of higher truths.[2] Quite in accordance with this view of the connection between revelation and nature, he supposed that in history also there was no such abrupt contrariety between revelation and natural development, but sought here after intermediate links, and was disposed to find, in the natural development of reason amongst the ancients, a point of entrance for revealed truths; and this direction of thought, in which he agreed with the Alexandrian theology, would have probably led him also to similar results as it had the older Alexandrian church-teachers, if the fetters of the church doctrine had not confined him.

But if the truth was, that even the Alexandrians themselves, in this striving after a point of mediation, had allowed themselves to be deceived by apparent analogies; the same might happen still more easily with Abelard, since he knew the Greek philosophers only from the reports of others, his ignorance of the Greek language not permitting him to go back to the very sources.[3] While it was impossible for him to arrive at any unprejudiced view of the doctrines of the ancient philosophers, he was still less in a condition to gain any correct notions respecting their lives, and respecting antiquity generally. Having no patience with the worldly lives of many churchmen and monks of his own times, he was the more inclined to draw an idealized picture of the strictness of life maintained by the ancient philosophers, which he held up for the purpose of shaming those Christians. And in this moral perfection of the ancient philosophers, he found a reason for supposing that God allowed them to attain already to the knowledge of those truths; that he, through his grace, vouchsafed to them such illumina-

[1] Quasi sacrae fidei et divinis rationibus ipsae naturae rerum a Deo conditarum inimicae videntur. Lib. ii, p. 1054.

[2] In tantum vero in ipsa factura delectatus Deus, ut frequenter ipsis rerum naturis, quas creavit, se figurari magis quam verbis nostris, quae nos continximus aut invenimus, exprimi velit, ut magis ipsa rerum similitudine, quam verborum nostrorum gaudeat proprietate, ut ad eloquentiae venustatem ipsis rerum naturis juxta aliquam similitudinem pro verbis scriptura malit uti, quam propriae locutionis integritatem sequi. L. c.

[3] Abelard says, in his Logic (ed. Cousin, p. 205), that he had read nothing of Plato's because his works had not been translated into Latin.

tion, in order to evince, by their example, how much more well-pleasing to him was a life abstracted from the world, than one devoted to its pleasures.[1] Abelard supposed especially that, in the idea of humility, in the recognition of God as the fountain-head of all true wisdom, a relationship might be traced between the Socratico-Platonic and the Christian positions; and that therefore what Paul says concerning the pride of worldly wisdom, could not have referred to Socrates and Plato. The whole description which Paul gives, in the first chapters of the epistle to the Romans, of the corruption of the pagan world, could, as it seemed to him, have no reference to philosophers so distinguished for their strict, abstemious lives, but must have applied to a few cases, rather than to the majority.[2] And it is here evident we must allow that, setting forth as he did the lives of the ancient philosophers after an idealized pattern, and approximating the antique standard more nearly to the Christian, he would thus be led to overlook that which is peculiar to the latter, the characterizing distinction between nature and grace, between all other human qualities and the specifically Christian. Still, he did not go so far as to maintain that those ancients could, by their moral perfection, without Christ, have ever attained to salvation. On the contrary, he declared expressly that faith in the Saviour is a means of salvation necessary for all; but he would not allow that this faith was wanting in the above-mentioned philosophy; for, had not the Sibyls prophesied concerning the Redeemer, some of them even more plainly than any of the prophets? And nothing certain could be inferred from the silence of the ancients; nor was the annunciation of a Saviour to be found in the writings of every one of the prophets.[3]

If we inquire into the relation of Abelard's dogmatic bent, as seen in this work, to that of Anselm, we shall find that the former agrees somewhat with the latter in his principle, that "*fides praecedit intellectum*." He saw, also, that religion has its seat in the heart; that the true knowledge of the truths of faith presupposed their reception by the heart, and that inner experience which comes from faith. But in his view of the way in which this faith arises,— in his notion of an "intellection" going before faith,— he turned from the direction of Anselm. He assumed, as his own position, that faith proceeds first from inquiry, that it works itself out of doubt by means of rational investigation. In this respect, then, he makes faith develop itself out of intellection, because one must first know why and what he believes, before he can believe; though, in another respect, he acknowledged that this intellection has its root in faith. He distinguished two different kinds of faith, and of intellection. If in Anselm's account of the relation of *ratio* to *fides*, we mark the impress of that quiet religious life which was never interrupted or dis-

[1] Oportebat quippe tunc etiam, ut in ipsis praesignaret Deus, per aliquod abundatioris gratiae donum, quam acceptior sit ei, qui sobrie vivit et se ab illecebris hujus mundi per contemptum ejus abstrahat, quam qui voluptatibus ejus deditus, spurcitiis omnibus se immergit. Lib. i. p. 1004

[2] Constat quippe philosophos maxime continentes vixisse atque ad continentiam tam scriptis, quam exemplis multas nobis exhortationes reliquisse.

[3] Lib. ii, pp. 1007 et 1008.

turbed by a doubt,—so in Abelard's theory, we may trace the reflection of his religious development, which had not been so harmonious, or so peaceful. We see how the reaction of that element of the understanding, so strongly predominant in him,—against doctrines of faith received by tradition,—asserted its full force, and how a variety of thoughts were suggested to his mind, which might have led him entirely astray from that simple, childlike faith; and to which he must have allowed a much freer admission than would have been warranted by the standard of that childlike faith as held by the theologians of his time. His theology took schism and doubt for its point of departure, and could never wholly repudiate its origin, but always showed evidence of having been made up of conflicting and unreconciled elements.

He himself, it is true, in the account he gives of his contests, ascribes all the attacks upon his school, to the jealousy of his opponents. But although this may have been true in part, yet it was assuredly saying too much. His enthusiastic pupils, who most gladly appropriated to themselves the scientific pretensions of their master, and retailed his assertions with exaggeration, must have especially contributed to provoke attacks upon him. As to the individual who was his first and his last opponent, though he misconceived Abelard's character and motives, yet he was not governed by personal passion, but by a simple interest for the cause of religion and of truth; and he was an entire stranger to the odious heresy-hunting spirit. This was Walter of Mauretania,[1] also called Walter a St. Victore, because he belonged to the regular clergy of that church. In intercourse with Abelard's disciples,[2] he had heard them repeat such assertions as these: that Abelard knew how to exhibit the mystery of the Trinity, as a matter perfectly comprehensible; he could make it perfectly clear to reason how three persons were to be conceived as subsisting in the unity of essence in God; how the Son was begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeded from Father and Son. If he urged against them passages of Holy Scripture, from which it clearly appeared that the perfect knowledge of the divine essence was reserved to the life eternal, they replied that these passages did not refer to a perfect *knowledge* that was first to be acquired in the life eternal, but to the perfect *blessedness* of the righteous in communion with God, to the *enjoyment* of which they would then first participate.[3] Still, Walter was careful not to charge the master with the positions advanced

[1] Not Mauretania in North Africa, but a place called Montagne in Flanders.

[2] In the letters of this person about to be referred to, there are, it is true, no exact chronological dates; still, the whole tone of the letter leads us to conclude that there had as yet been no public attacks made on Abelard; and this is confirmed by the fact that Walter of Mauretania takes notice of Abelard's theology only in the first form under which it appeared.

[3] D'Archery Spicileg. t. iii, f. 524: Quod istae auctoritates non removent ab hac vita trinitatis perfectissimam notitiam, sed perfectam delectationem de illa scientia pro venientem. In the writings of Abelard himself we find, indeed, no such assertion, but only the distinction between the intellectus in this life, and the intuition of the immediately present in the life eternal.

by his pupils; as he was very well aware how easily a teacher may be misconceived, and how easily it may happen for pupils to ascribe to the master their own opinions, in order to give them additional authority.[1] He waited till he could get sight of Abelard's book, which has been mentioned; where, again, he met with many of these positions which had offended him, as uttered by his disciples. Nor did he even then stand forth publicly against Abelard; but wrote him a letter, in which he explained at large his doubts, and invited him, by mutual communications in writing, to come to an understanding with him on these points, since in this way the whole matter might be investigated in the most quiet manner.[2]

Walter was, to be sure, by no means a match for so practised a dialectician. It is remarkable that he brought against him the most contradictory accusations; on the one hand, that he attributed too much to knowledge; on the other, that he spoke too skeptically, — when in the preface to his work he observed, he did not promise so much to speak the truth, as to exhibit, in compliance with the requests of his pupils, his own opinions.[3] Who, in discoursing of the Catholic faith, could so express himself as if he were discoursing of a mere opinion? Who, on hearing another promise, not the truth, but only his opinions, would place any faith in what he held forth? Abelard was right, however, in warning his pupils against the delusive idea that any man could present absolute truth. He was right in distinguishing the truth of faith, in itself, from a human attempt to make it intelligible. Walter, again, in endeavoring to draw sharply the line of discrimination between the hither side and the yonder side in the knowledge of divine things,— in opposition to Abelard,— committed the mistake of robbing several passages in the Gospel of St. John — which refer to the connection of the hither side and the yonder side in the life of Christian faith — of their true significance, and distorting their meaning. Thus, for example, he cited against Abelard, John 17: 3, and understood here, contrary to the connection of ideas in the evangelical writer, the eternal life as something future.[4] With more propriety he could appeal to 1 Corinth. 13: 12.[5] The other party presented in opposition to him, however, Matth. 11: 27, and John 14: 9. In the heat of controversy, Walter was driven to refer even these passages,

[1] Solet autem frequenter fieri, quod discipuli discordent a sensu magistrorum sive per imperitiam verba eorum male exponendo sive ad ostensionem sui aliquas novitates inducendo, quas majoris auctoritatis magistris suis licet ignorantibus consueverunt adscribere.

[2] Sine ira et disceptatione, quae animos disputantium et praesentialiter colloquentium frequenter solent commovere et mentis oculum obfuscare.

[3] Non tam nos veritatem dicere promittentes, quam opinionis nostrae sensum, quem efflagitant exponentes. Page 974.

[4] It would undoubtedly be more common to use these passages thus, since even Abelard already referred to such a mode of apprehending them; and did not once use the good right he had to turn such passages directly in opposition to his adversaries: Quae (which refers to the Trinity) penitus in hac vita non posse intelligi asseverant, sed hoc ipsum intelligi vitam dicunt aeternam. Juxta illud Joann. 17, 3 et iterum: Manifestabo eis meipsum. Opp. lib. ii, page 1061.

[5] His verbis aperte insinuat, se ad praesens imperfecte et obscure videre Deum, sed in futuro ad perfectam et claram Dei notitiam perventurum, et sicut a Deo est cognitus, ita in futuro se divinam essentiam nosciturum.

also, to the future life, and to adopt an arbitrary method of interpretation often resorted to in far later times; maintaining that here, as frequently in the prophetic writings, the preterite tense was substituted for the future, in order to express certainty. Yet here, he did not feel sure of his ground, and therefore added: although these passages might, like John 6: 40, refer to the present life, still, they treated only of a position held by faith, and the imperfect knowledge connected therewith,—just as the promise in John 16: 13 treated only of that which in *this* life it was necessary for the faithful to *know* in order to salvation.[1]

The doctrines taught by Abelard in the book referred to, and in his lectures, afforded sufficient occasion for representing him — judged by the standard of the common theology — as a teacher of error. Owing to the want of unprejudiced reports[2] it is impossible to decide how much is to be attributed, in the first open attacks against him, to a pure interest for the cause of truth, and how much to jealousy and personal passion. Different motives may have operated together. Certainly, Abelard, under the existing circumstances, could expect to experience no better fate than Roscelin. At a synod held at Soissons, in the year 1121, he yielded to the power of his adversaries, and consented to cast his book with his own hands into the fire. He was for the present condemned, as a false teacher, to confinement in a monastery, where he was to do penance. But as Abelard's patron, bishop Gottfried of Chartres, who sought to bring the dispute to a peaceful termination at the council, had already, by way of consolation, assured him, this mode of condemning him without a hearing would only serve to call forth in the greater number of his enthusiastic adherents a livelier sympathy for his cause, in a very few days Conon, the papal legate, who had presided at that council, permitted him to return back to the abbey of St. Denis. But his restless spirit, which would never allow him to be silent where any antiquated prejudice confronted him with a lie, did not permit him to remain long here in the enjoyment of quiet. The monks, embittered towards him already on account of his lectures of reform, became still more excited by an assertion of his, which threatened greatly to injure the authority and interests of the abbey; which rested solely on the tradition that the person after whom it was named, the Areopagite converted by St. Paul, was the founder of the French church. Now Abelard, in attacking this error, which had stood its ground for so many centuries,[3] afforded the angry monks the best opportunity for revenge; since he who would rob France of her patron saint could easily be held forth as the enemy of the empire and of the nation. He fled from the perse-

[1] Nec intelligendum est, quod sanctis in hac vita positis filius notificaverit omnia, quae audivit a patre, ad futurum seculum pertinentia, sed potius omnia, quae sunt eis in praesenti necessaria, ut salutem consequantur.

[2] For what Abelard (himself a party concerned, and very violent) says, in his Historia Calamitatum, cannot be considered as altogether worthy of credit.

[3] In combating the error, he still did not light upon the truth; for he suffered himself to be misled by a false statement of Beda's, and to take this Dionysius for the bishop Dionysius of Corinth.

cutions which assailed him to the territory of the count Theobald of Champagne. In the district of Troyes, he built himself a hermitage of reeds and straw, which afterwards he dedicated to the Holy Spirit, the Comforter (*Paraclete*), who permitted him here to find peace after so many storms. It was absolute poverty, as he himself relates, — the want of everything necessary for the support of life, which first induced him to resume his lectures in this place. Soon, multitudes of young men, of all ranks, resorted to the spot to hear him. Those who had been brought up in splendor and luxury shrunk not from sharing his deprivations, and imitating his strict mode of life. With the labor of their own hands, or with their substance, they provided for their own bodily wants, and rebuilt his chapel with stone. But the enthusiasm with which his pupils, scattered in all directions, spoke of him and of his teachings, was the means of drawing upon him new persecutions. He now retired from public notice, having accepted in the year 1128, the abbacy of Nuits in Brittany. But the place became very annoying to him, on account of his quarrels with the rude, undisciplined monks. In 1136, he resigned this preferment, and for a year gave lectures again in Paris. His scholars were scattered over all France; and the writings which he had published since the time of those first contests, created a great sensation; new storms were thus excited against him, and the way was now prepared for a contest of more general interest and significance than any preceding one. Let us now first cast a glance at the writings which had meanwhile been published by him, and the doctrines in them which were particularly offensive to his times, so far as the subject is not immediately connected with the history of special doctrines.

His "Introduction to Theology," which had been condemned at the council of Soissons, he sent forth, under another shape, in his work[1] "on Christian Theology," but without softening the harshness of those passages which, in the first edition, had given offence to many. Some of them, on the contrary, were expressed still more pointedly than before. He endeavored, in this work, to show more clearly the agreement between the ancient philosophy and Christianity. "In life and doctrine," he maintained, "the old philosophers came very near to apostolical perfection, and were not far, if at all, removed from Christianity; indeed, the very terms philosophy and Christianity were very nearly related to each other; for Christians were so called from Christ, the true wisdom, and they who truly loved Christ might, with propriety, be called philosophers."[2] "If the appeal to motives of fear and reward constituted the main difference between the Jewish position of servitude and the Christian position of grace and freedom, where love is held forth as the motive of all actions; then philosophy, which represents love to God as the highest motive, was, on this point, more nearly akin to Christianity than Judaism."[3] If it were objected that,

[1] In Martene et Durand Thesaur. nov. anecdot. t. v.

[2] Cum nos a vera philosophia, hoc est sapientia Dei patris, Christiani dicamur, vere in hoc dicendi philosophi, si vere Christum diligimus. Theol. Christian. lib. ii, t. v, f. 1210.

[3] Morum et honestatis rationibus secun-

with those philosophers, the matter of discussion was certainly not love to God, but only love to what is good, he replied, that "this amounted to the same thing, since God is the original fountain of all good;"[1] a reply, indeed, very far from satisfactorily determining anything with regard to a religious principle of action; but he affirmed that the principle of love to God was also found actually expressed in them, as the motive to all true goodness. Hence the preaching of the gospel had met with a more ready reception from the philosophers than from the Jews; for it appeared more nearly conformed to the groundwork of their principles; differing, perhaps, from what they already possessed, only in the doctrine of the resurrection and of the incarnation of the Son of God: for the morality of the gospel, strictly taken, was but a reformation of the law of nature (*reformatio legis naturalis*), and this moral law of nature the philosophers had followed. On the other hand, the Mosaic law occupied itself more with those ceremonial ordinances which had a typical significance, than with the moral element, and more with external than with internal righteousness. But the gospel, like philosophy, estimated the worth of all actions by the disposition of the heart. Thus Abelard, from paying no regard to the connection between the ethical and dogmatic elements in Christianity, and hence failing to give prominence to what constitutes the grand distinction between the ancient and the Christian principle in morals, was brought up at a point where he seemed compelled to place Christianity in closer relation with the Hellenic philosophy than with Judaism; and the question would naturally suggest itself, What need, then, of Christianity? Has it only the merit of having perfected philosophical morality, and introduced it into the general consciousness of mankind? This was a position which Abelard, as we shall see by comparing it with his other doctrines, was very far from taking. At the same time we must not forget, that his impatience with the rudeness of his times, made him the more inclined to extol the life of antiquity. "Would that, by the examples of the heathens," says he, "the abbots of these times might at least be made ashamed of themselves, who, in the very eyes of their brethren the monks, that live on a spare and scanty diet, gorge, without blushing, vast quantities of the most costly viands."[2] He contrasts the example of Plato, who banished poets from his republic, with the bishops of his time, who, on high festivals, instead of wholly spending the sacred time in giving praise to God, invited jesters, dancers, and singers of libidinous songs to their tables, entertaining themselves the whole day and night with such company, and then rewarding them

dum caritatis libertatem, quod in gratia vocati sumus, non secundum Judaicam ex timore poenarum et ambitione terrenorum, non (this *non* is without doubt a false reading, for it manifestly stands in contradiction with what follows), ex desiderio aeternorum, nobis plurimum philosophos certum est assentire.

[1] Quodsi id minus videtur esse ad meritum salvationis, quod dicitur amore virtutis et non potius amore Dei, ac si virtutem vel aliquod bonum opus habere possimus, quod non secundum ipsum Deum ac propter ipsum sit

[2] Erubescant ad haec hujus temporis abbates, quibus summa religionis monasticae cura commissa est, erubescant, inquam, et resipiscant saltem gentilium exemplo commoti, quod in oculis fratrum vilia pulmentorum pabula ruminantum exquisita fercula ac multiplicia impudenter devorant, f 1215

with great presents at the expense of the poor.[1] Nay more, they even profaned, with such sports, the very churches themselves.[2]

The ideas of Abelard, set forth already in his "Introduction," on the relation of *ratio* to *fides*, on the intellection proceeding from the interior religious life, we meet once more in this new form of his work. He declares himself strongly opposed to an aristocracy of knowledge in Christianity. He acknowledges that a right understanding of religious truths can only be obtained through the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit; and that such influences are bestowed on none but the pure in heart. More was attained here by a religious life, than by intellectual talents. Nor could it be otherwise; for, if it were, our Lord would have signified that talents were more acceptable to him than a holy life. From the religion that has its seat in the feelings, everything should proceed, and back upon the same everything should react. He supposes a mutual action and reaction between knowing and feeling: "The more we feel of God, the more we love him; and, with progress in the knowledge of him, the flame of love grows brighter." Yet he is aware of the fact that religious life and intellectual culture do not always keep pace with each other; that a man may have more in his immediate religious consciousness than he is able to express or explain; since he may be destitute of the necessary organ for this, or the requisite degree of mental cultivation: "although they who to us seem simple and ignorant, and yet possess piety so much the more fervid, want only the ability to express that knowledge which divine inspiration bestows on them."[3] He himself declaimed against those of his contemporaries who set up to be teachers of theology without reforming their lives, and who, while living to the flesh, pretended to a special knowledge of the divine mysteries.

Furthermore, he published, after this work, his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in which the dogmatic and ethical digressions constitute what is most peculiar.[4] Among those doctrines of this book

[1] Quid in solennibus magnarum festivitatum diebus, quae penitus in laudibus Dei expendi debent, joculatores, saltatores, incantatores turpium acciunt ad mensam, totam diem et noctem cum illis feriant atque sabbatizant, magnis postmodum eos remunerant praemiis, quae de ecclesiasticis rapiunt beneficiis, de oblationibus pauperum, ut immolent certe daemoniis?

[2] Parum fortassis et hoc diabolus reputat, quod extra sacra loca basilicarum gerunt, nisi etiam scenicas turpitudines in ecclesiam Dei introducat. f. 1240.

[3] Quo plus de Deo a nobis sentitur, plus a nobis intelligitur et cum profectu intelligentiae caritatis accenditur flamma, licet hi qui simplices ac idiotae nobis videntur et ideo vehementer sint ferventes nec tantum exprimere aut disserere queant, quantum iis intelligentiae divina inspiratio confert. Lib. iii, f. 1250.

[4] In a passage of this tract (lib. i, p. 513) he cites the first book, as follows: "In theologiae nostrae opusculo," and the passage he cites, the hint at the doctrine of the Trinity in the writings of the ancient philosophers is actually to be found there. On the contrary (lib. i, p. 554), he speaks of his Theology as a work which still remained to be published: "Theologiae nostrae tractatui reservamus." But the consistency of these two statements with each other is explained by the fact that, in the last case, he is discoursing on the point how justification per Christum is to be understood, — a question he has not treated in his Theologia christiana, which has come down to us. It is evident, then, that he had it in view to extend that sketch, which embraced but a small part of the doctrines of faith, to the whole sum of those doctrines, as he was accustomed to hold them forth in his lectures, of which we have a part in his *Sententiae*, published by Professor Rheinwald; and in this further prosecution of his theological system, then had in view, he in-

which excited special remark, belongs Abelard's opinion respecting disinterested love to God. He held that the love which seeks a reward, and is not exercised towards God simply for his own sake, deserved not to be called love at all. The majority of men, indeed nearly all, had fallen into so wrong a state of feeling as to be ready to avow that, if they did not hope to obtain some benefit from God, they would cease to worship and love him. But God, even when he punishes, ought none the less to be loved; since he would not do this unless justice required it, and so in his justice God would manifest himself as worthy of love. "Whoever seeks in God, not himself, but something else, does not in reality love *him*, but that other thing. But perhaps it will be said: although we seek our blessedness in God, yet it is a pure and sincere love; for supreme blessedness consists, indeed, in the very fact that God communicates himself to us."[1] To this he replies: "It is only then a pure love to God, when it has for its object only God as he is in himself; without respect to that which he communicates to us. In this case, we shall alike love him, in whatever way he may treat us or others. Such, in fact, is the true love of the wife for her husband, — of the father for his son; it will remain the same, even though they may experience nothing but detriment on account of the object of their love. O that we might have," says he, "so upright a disposition of heart towards the Lord, as to love him far more on his own account, because he is so good in himself, than on account of the benefits which he brings to us! So would our righteousness fully render to him what he claims, that, because he is supremely good, he should be supremely loved by all. Fear, and hope of reward, are but the first step in piety: 'The fear of the Lord is the *beginning* of wisdom.' But the perfection of it, is pure love to God for his own sake."[2]

It is manifest, when we consider the doctrines of Bernard,[3] already explained, concerning the different stages or degrees of love, that these two men, who were so diametrically opposed to each other in their general mode of thinking, nevertheless agreed in what they regarded as moral perfection, with only this difference: that Bernard, that experienced and careful guide of souls, understood better how to distinguish the different stages of development in the religious life, and to let himself down to their necessities. Of the middle theory, attempted by Hugo a St. Victore, we shall speak hereafter.

Abelard was the first, also, among the men of the new scientific direction, to compose a particular work on morals; namely, his Scito te ipsum.[4] Here, however, he put forth many a bold assertion, which sometimes for good reason, sometimes without any at all, would be likely to appear offensive to the church-theologians of his time.

tended to enter into the investigation of this question also. But the agitations of his life did not allow him an opportunity of executing his purpose. He also had it in view at that time to put forth a work on the subject of Ethics. Lib. ii, p. 560: "Nostrae id ethicae discussioni reservemus."

[1] Quoniam Deus seipso nos, non alia re est remuneraturus, et seipsum, quo nihil majus est, nobis est daturus.

[2] Page 622, et seqq.

[3] Page 260.

[4] Pez, t. iii, p. ii, f. 646.

Like Augustin, to whose authority, moreover, he appealed, Abelard stood forth in opposition to the externalizing and isolating tendency favored by the practice of the church, which led men, in estimating the morality of actions, to regard rather the *materiel* of the action, the *opus operatum* of good works, than the standard of the inward disposition. As already in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans we saw him pointing to the pure love of God as the motive of all true goodness, so here to that outward, *quantitative* method of estimating moral actions, he opposed the principle that everything depended on the intention. This principle was, to be sure, not peculiar to him; it had passed over, through the influence of the Augustinian spirit, into the theological consciousness of his times, and in it theologians of opposite tendencies were agreed. Thus the mystic Richard a St. Victore observes: "A work without a good intention is like a body without life. That which appears to be good is still not good without this."[1] By Abelard, this generally acknowledged principle was only placed at the head, and with the consequences flowing from it, still further unfolded. "All actions," said he, "abstractly and externally considered, are in themselves indifferent; the intention only gives them moral worth. Only when considered in connection with the intention of the agent are they capable of moral adjudication. That is the tree which yields either good fruit or bad."[2] This proposition he took up again in his work on Ethics, unfolding it still farther, with the important consequences which it involved. "God," he affirmed, "judges actions by the intention, not by the outward act."[3] "Two men may do the same thing; and yet it shall be entirely different, considered in reference to the different intentions of the doers. The elect and the reprobate may perform the same works; the intention with which they perform them alone separates the one from the other." Thus he lighted upon the right way of deciding the contested question, whether there were actions indifferent (*adiaphora*); in how far all or none might be without any moral character. Nevertheless, he was, on the one hand, too much confined by the doctrines of the church, from which he by no means wished to depart, to follow out in a consistent manner all the consequences which his penetrating mind saw to be deducible from this weighty and pregnant principle; while, on the other hand, he was betrayed into false positions by pushing what was right in itself to an extreme, and was thus very apt in combating one error to fall into the opposite. He would drive a proposition, true in itself, to such lengths as could hardly fail to result in that sophistical method of treating morals, which presents the whole too much on the

[1] Quod est corpus sine vita, hoc est opus sine intentione bona. Sicut vita a corde procedit, et se per omnia membra diffundit, sic et intentio bona de consilio surgit et virtutum opera ad meriti vegetationem animare consuevit. De statu interioris hominis Tractat. i, c. vii.

[2] Quia opera indifferentia sunt in se, nec bona nec mala, sive remuneratione digna videantur, nisi secundum radicem intentionis, quae est arbor bonum vel malum proferens fructum. Comment. in Roman. lib. i, p. 522.

[3] Non quae fiant, sed quo animo fiant, pensat Deus nec in opere, sed in intentione meritum operantis vel laus consistit. Omnia in se indifferentia nec nisi pro intentione agentis bona vel mala dicenda sunt.

subjective side. For as the objective and subjective elements belong together, no action can be correctly estimated except in connection with the intention expressed by it; but neither can a right moral intention express itself except in the form of an action corresponding to the moral law; and therefore, to separate elements which should be so closely connected, could only lead to a one-sided theory, and errors directly opposed to each other in the system of morals.

Thus, for example, from the proposition above mentioned, he derives the consequence that, "as morality is only grounded in that which stands within man's power, the *intentio animi*, not in the outward act, the performance or non-performance of which depends on circumstances that do not stand under man's control, so the completed action contributes nothing towards increasing the moral worth, which lies exclusively in the intention. If we call a man's intention a good one, and his work a good one, still, we have not here two things that are good, but only one good thing in the intention."[1] But, in fixing his eye on this single element, he overlooks the consideration that it may depend not only on the circumstances, but also on the strength or feebleness of the "intention;" whether that intention which, in order to its actual realization, may have to pass through many intermediate steps, and overcome many obstacles, really attains to its end or not.

Again, this vaguely stated proposition might be so understood as if, in estimating the morality of an action, everything depended on the subjective intention, or purpose, and not at all on the objective act; so that every man might be justified on the ground of his good intentions, although he may have failed of doing right, through error. And so the intention at bottom would have to be approved in many actions bad in themselves. Accordingly, we find him proposing the following question: "How are we to judge, then, concerning those who persecuted Christ himself or the Christians, thinking that they thereby did what was acceptable to God; persons who from the position they occupied, from the degree of their knowledge, could not do otherwise, or, if they had done otherwise, would have sinned against their consciences?" His loosely conceived principle must have led him to pronounce the doings of such persons good, as proceeding from a right intention. But when he came actually to adopt this result, to which he saw himself forced by his premises; on the one hand, the door was thrown open for all manner of arbitrary judgments in morals; while on the other, he found himself involved in a dispute with regard to those principles, by which the actions of unbelievers were judged according to the standard doctrine of the church, and driven into

[1] Cum dicimus intentionem hominis bonam et opus illius bonum, duo quidem distinguimus, intentionem scilicet ac opus, unam tamen bonitatem intentionis. This favorite position of Abelard, which certainly was often advanced by him in his lectures, is found also in the Dialogus inter philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum, published from the treasures of the imperial library at Vienna, by Dr. Rheinwald, in the year 1831, page 115: Non actiones vel bonae vel malae, nisi secundum intentionis radicem judicantur, sed omnes ex se indifferentes sunt, et si diligentes inspiciamus nihil ad meritum conferunt, quae nequaquam ex se bonae sunt aut malae, cum ipsae videlicet tam reprobis quam electis aeque conveniant.

many heretical assertions. This contradiction he was desirous of avoiding. Accordingly, he acquiesced in the judgment which, conformably to the church principles, must be pronounced on all actions of unbelievers, although by so doing he contradicted himself; and in acknowledging the condemnation of unbelievers, he took refuge, as was customary for those to do who held the doctrine of absolute predestination, in the incomprehensibleness of the divine decrees. Yet in his own expressions are to be found thoughts which, had they only been still farther unfolded, would have enabled him to avoid this contradiction, not indeed with the doctrines of the church, but at least with himself, and to find a solution of that difficulty, by which solution the holiness of the moral law would be secured against all arbitrary procedures. He remarks, for instance,[1] "that what had been said of good intentions, did by no means apply to everything a man might *believe he did* with good intention, when this intention itself was a mistaken one, when the eye of the soul was not single, so as to be able to discover clearly, and guard against error;" and he refers the saying of Christ, respecting the eye as the light of the body, to the purity and clearness of the intention, which spreads its light over the whole life. It was only necessary, in truth, that he should have applied these thoughts to a more exact determination of the principle which he had expressed, in order to secure it against all misunderstanding and all false application. The pretended *bona intentio*, that proceeds from an error grounded in a faulty darkening of the understanding, is really, in this view, to be called no good intention at all. The good intention, is only a pure and clear intention.

With this principle, that in morals all depends on the intention that governs the life, was joined, in the theory of Abelard, a view strictly connected, no doubt, with the whole history of his own moral progress, from which an essential modification of the anthropology of the church could not fail to proceed. Abelard, in truth, resembled Augustin, in this respect, that he had many occasions of experiencing in his own case the might of the flesh in resistance to the spirit. But while Augustin was inclined, when the spirit had obtained the victory in him, so much the more sharply to condemn all striving of the flesh against the spirit, Abelard, on the other hand, was determined, by the memory of his earlier experiences, to pass a milder judgment on such appearances. "It is not the temptations of lust," he thinks, "that are sinful; but the morality depends here on the fact whether the ruling bias of the will overcomes these temptations or yields to them. One man has, by nature, stronger propensities to this sin, another to that. This temptation to sin, is not sin; it serves rather for the exercise of virtue in him who victoriously sustains the contest. Sin is only when one suffers himself to be drawn by those solicitations into transgression of the divine law, into practical contempt of God. Sin, generally, is but the not doing or not omitting to do on God's account what one should do or omit doing on God's account. The true merit

[1] L. c. c. xii, f. 652.

of virtue consists in this: that, in conflict with ourselves, we do God's will, overcoming those hindrances in our nature, where the might of sinful lust asserts itself.[1] What would there be great in obeying God's will, if our inclinations were always in harmony with the same?" From such a position it seems to follow, that the more there is in a man of that excitement to lust, if he do but combat and overcome it, the greater will be his virtue: that generally, without some conflict of flesh with spirit, no virtue can be conceived to exist; and that this susceptibility was originally planted in human nature as a thing necessary to moral development: which thoughts, prosecuted to a farther extent, would have led him to a Pelagian anthropology; from which, however, he was at the farthest remove.

Since Abelard, then, referred everything in moral judgments to the intention, and nothing to the act in itself, it presented itself to him as a necessary conclusion, that moral worth could be truly estimated by God only, to whom the intention of the heart is manifest. And hence followed the necessity of drawing sharp the line of discrimination between every human tribunal, not only civil, but ecclesiastical, and the tribunal of God; which distinction led him to many important deductions with regard to the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops, deductions that might easily involve him in controversy with the reigning system of the church.

His view of the essence of true repentance would be determined accordingly. He would allow that alone to be true repentance, which proceeded from love to God, and pain for having offended him; and on this principle he attacked with a boldness that cared for no consequences, the method of penance, as administered by the bishops and priests of his time.[2]

Another thing serving to illustrate the peculiar bent of Abelard, is a work of his, recently come to light,[3] which, like its fellows, must have given great offence to the church-theologians, — the book which appeared under the title "*Sic et Non*," (Yes and No.) Following the same plan with the Monophysite Stephen Gobarus, of more ancient times, he brought together the sayings of the older church-teachers on different subjects of faith and of morals, in a hundred and fifty-seven rubrics. But while, according to the common method of procedure, men endeavored to set forth, in the ancient dogmatic tradition, only those points in which there was an agreement, Abelard, on the other hand, like that old Monophysite, preferred rather to give prominence to those points where the church-teachers contradicted one another in their answers to various questions. When such contrary opinions were brought together in other cases, it was simply for the purpose of attempting to reconcile them by means of some dialectical process. But Abelard left these opposite declarations standing side by side, without any attempt at reconciliation. It was his object, it would seem, to operate against that tendency which required entire

[1] His words: Quid enim magnum pro Deo facimus, si nihil nostrae voluntati adversum toleramus, sed magis quod volumus, implemus.

[2] See the citation on p. 6.

[3] Published by Cousin, in the collection above mentioned.

uniformity in dogmatical expression, by exhibiting to view the opposition of opinions that existed amongst the most important church-teachers themselves. He wanted to show those who were ready to fix the stigma of heresy on any dogmatical propositions that deviated from the common form, how easy it was to find offensive things even in the most highly revered teachers of the church. Perhaps not without some reference to the conduct of his adversaries towards himself, he says: "Who does not see how impertinent it is for one man to set himself up as judge over the sense and understanding of another, when it is to God alone that the hearts and thoughts of all men lie open; and when he warns us against this arrogant presumption, saying, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged'? And the apostle says: 'Judge nothing before the time, till the Lord come, who shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make known the secrets of the heart.'[1] As if he had plainly said: 'In such matters, leave him to judge who alone knows all things, and explores the very thoughts of men.'"[2]

We have already seen, on a former page, how the remarks of Abelard, on the relation of the apostles to one another, were based on a view of inspiration that deviated from the common one, — a view that forbade him to extend the immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit to all in like measure, and led him to make a more distinct separation of the divine from the human. Now that which we must recognize as lying at the basis of Abelard's earlier remarks, is clearly expressed by him in the prologue to this book. "It is plain," says he, "that the prophets themselves sometimes failed of possessing the gift of prophecy, and that, from the custom of prophesying, they uttered some things, when they supposed they had the spirit of prophecy, which were erroneous, and the product of their own minds. And this was permitted in them, that it might serve to keep them humble, and that they might learn more clearly to distinguish between what they were by their own minds, and what they were by the Spirit of God, and understand that it was a gift of God, when the Spirit of the Infallible dwelt in them. Nor even when they possessed this Spirit did he work everything in them after the same manner, or cause them to see alike; for as he does not bestow all gifts at once on the same individual, so neither does he enlighten the soul of him whom he fills on all subjects, but reveals sometimes this and sometimes that, and in revealing one thing hides another.[3] If, therefore, it is manifest that the prophets and apostles themselves were not wholly exempt from error, how can we be surprised to find that, in the voluminous writings

[1] 1 Corinth. 4: 5.

[2] See the Prologue to the book "Sic et non," p. 5, ed. Cousin.

[3] Constat vero, et prophetas ipsos quandoque prophetiae gratia caruisse, et nonnulla ex usu prophetandi, cum se spiritum prophetiae habere crederent, per spiritum suum falsa protulisse; et hoc eis ad humilitatis custodiam permissum esse, ut sic videlicet verius cognoscerent, quales per spiritum Dei et quales per suum existerent, et se eum, qui mentiri vel falli nescit, ex dono habere, cum haberent. Qui etiam eum haberent, sicut non omnia uni confert dona, ita nec de omnibus mentem ejus, quem replet, illuminat, sed modo hoc, modo illud revelat et cum unum aperit, alterum occultat.

of the church-fathers, many things have been erroneously stated.[1] But though many things may have been erroneously stated by them, yet such statements are not falsehoods, but errors of ignorance. It was their belief that by such statements they should best subserve the edification of others. They acted by the impulse of charity; and God looks at the intention." It was one of Abelard's favorite sayings, that the "intention" is the "eye of the mind," to which he would add also that fine remark of Augustin, often cited by him: "*Habe caritatem et fac quicquid vis.*"

We have said already that Abelard distinguished, in the truths transmitted by the sacred writings, those properly belonging to faith and the religious interests generally, and those having no immediate concern with these interests. So, too, in the sayings of the church-fathers, he distinguishes the errors that stand in no necessary connection with these interests from errors which affect the vital essence of the faith: and this distinction led him, perhaps, to conclude that the idea of inspiration, also, in the sacred Scriptures, was not to be applied to the portion that treats of such indifferent matters. "Although God," he remarks here, "left holy men themselves to commit mistakes in things tending to no injury of the faith, yet even this is not without its benefit to those to whom all things work together for good. The church-teachers themselves were conscious of this liability, and therefore felt themselves bound to make many corrections in their own works, and by so doing have conceded also to those who come after them the right of correcting them, — or, of refusing to follow them, when it was not in their power to retract or correct their own errors." At the close of this prologue, he observes that he had compiled this collection of opposite statements with a view to incite the reader to the search after the truth, and to sharpen his faculties by the labor of investigation. And here he appeals to the words of Aristotle: that "it is not easy for a man to assert anything with confidence unless he has first repeatedly examined into the matter; and that it is not without its use to have doubted of everything."[2] "For doubt," he adds, "leads us to inquiry, and by inquiry we arrive at the truth,[3] as the very Truth himself says: 'Seek, and ye shall find.' Christ himself, when, at the age of twelve, he instead of teaching sat and inquired in the temple, would teach us by his own example that we should learn by inquiry." It is obvious in what contrariety to the repose of child-like faith, that characterizes the religious spirit of his time, the tendency expressed in these words must have stood. A critical direction in opposition to implicit faith, and aiming to arrive at the knowledge of the truth through doubt, was a foretoken of developments which could beat their way through only at a much later period.

[1] Quid itaque mirum, cum ipsos etiam prophetas et apostolos ab errore non penitus fuisse constat alienos, si in tam multiplici sanctorum patrum scriptura nonnulla propter supra positam causam erronee prolata seu scripta videantur?

[2] Aristotle's Categories, § 7, ed. Bekker, i, p. 8.

[3] Dubitando enim ad inquisitionem venimus, inquirendo veritatem percipimus.

We have seen before, that Abelard could not present a full exhibition of his doctrinal system in his "*Theologia Christiana.*" But in his lectures he had given to his hearers his complete system of the doctrines of faith; and of these lectures many copies were in circulation, and contained matter which tended to increase the inclination to put down Abelard as a heretic. To be sure, he had a right to complain when extracts from those copies of his lectures on theology, which his opponents had contrived to get into their hands, were used in the same way as if they had been so written out by himself, although it must have been altogether a matter of uncertainty how far his hearers had rightly understood him, and faithfully taken down his remarks.[1]

Thus the new writings published by Abelard himself, the widely dispersed copies of his lectures, and the high encomiums of his scholars scattered through all France, drew upon him once more the attention of those who believed themselves called to watch over the interests of the orthodox faith; and that, to his injury. William, once abbot of St. Thierry, now a monk in the Cistercian abbey at Signy, first stood forth to complain against him. He sent to Gottfried bishop of Chartres, and to Bernard abbot of Clairvaux, certain papers filled with invectives against Abelard, and professing to expose his heresies in a number of theses taken from his work on theology.[2] In an accompanying letter, he expatiated on the danger which threatened the church from the writings of one who exercised the great influence of Abelard: "Abelard once more writes and teaches new doctrines. His books pass beyond the seas and over the Alps; his new opinions about the faith are disseminated through the provinces and the empire,

[1] Concerning the propositions of Abelard which were accused of being heretical, it was said: Haec capitula partim in libro Theologiae magistri Petri, partim in libro sententiarum ejusdem, partim in libro, cujus titulus est: "Scito te ipsum," reperta sunt. But Abelard, in his apology, complained that a book, called the Sentences, was cited as his, when he had never written such a book. He attributes the false charge to ignorance or ill-will. But also Walter of Mauretania, in his work, "Contra quatuor Galliae Labyrinthos," cites what, without any doubt, is the same work, of which he says that it has the title, "Incipiunt sententiae divinitatis," ("The Theological Sentences.") Yet Walter himself was uncertain to what extent this work belonged to Abelard, since he says: Fertur hic liber Petri Abelardi fuisse, aut ex libris ejus excerptus. From this, we may gather that the opponents of Abelard must at least have had a certain appearance of right, in making use of this book as one that came from him; but that Abelard also must have had good grounds for affirming that he had never written such a book. Now professor Rheinwald, who has done so much towards giving an account of the literary labors of Abelard, published in 1835, from manuscripts in the library of Munich, a book intituled "Sententiae Abelardi." This book perfectly agrees, in many passages, with Abelard's "Theologia Christiana," but expresses a good deal in a more concise form; while the doctrinal system in it is carried out to the conclusion. Everything is explained, if, with Gieseler, we suppose that the Sententiae were copies of Abelard's lectures on the doctrines of faith, which had been scattered abroad in different transcripts; such as had been made by his auditors according to their necessities. The transcript which Walter of Mauretania had before him, contained also the words of the address with which Abelard began his lectures: Omnes sitientes venite ad aquas et bibite, amici, inebriamini carissimi. See Buolaei, Hist. univers. Paris, iii, f. 200. The copy published by Rheinwald appears, from what may be gathered from comparing it with Abelard's other writings, to be a faithful one, and may doubtless be used to fill up the vacancy in that exhibition of his doctrines, which we have taken from works which came immediately from his own hand.

[2] We find this writing complete in the Bibliotheca Cisterciensis of Tissier, t. iv, f 112, seqq.

are frequently held forth, and boldly defended ; so *that they are said to have authority even in the Roman curia* (scholars of his, even amongst the cardinals)." One proof of the blind zeal that governed this man, is the fact that Abelard's two tracts, the "*Scito te ipsum*," and the "*Sic et non*," looked already suspicious on account of their, to him, "extraordinary titles;"[1] and because these books had not been so greatly multiplied by transcripts as the work on Theology, and he himself had never got sight of them,—he gathered from this that they shrunk from the light.[2] Bernard had his attention directed also, from other quarters, to the erroneous doctrines spread by Abelard and his school; and several other offensive propositions were pointed out to him in Abelard's *Scito te ipsum*, and in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. At first, he is said to have expostulated with Abelard in a private manner, and exhorted him to desist from holding forth such doctrines, and also to prevent his scholars from repeating them. But the two men differed too much from each other in the whole bent of their minds, and perhaps also were already too much excited against each other, to have it in their power to come to any mutual understanding. Personal contact would serve, therefore, only to increase the alienation already existing between them.[3] When Abelard was compelled to hear that he had been stigmatized as a heretic,—believing that it was in his power to defend himself against all the charges brought against his orthodoxy, he determined to anticipate the condemnation which threatened him,—and, applying to the archbishop of Sens, demanded to be heard before a synod, and to be allowed to defend himself against his accusers. Archbishop Senglier, therefore, invited the abbot Bernard to appear with Abelard at the synod, which was held in the year 1140, at Sens. Bernard was at the beginning not inclined to enter into a dispute with his rival. He did not consider himself to be a match for one who had been a practised dialectician from his youth. It was the concern of the bishops to judge with regard to doctrines ; nothing more was required than simply to look at Abelard's writings, which amply sufficed to establish a complaint against him. The doctrines of faith had been fixed and settled once for all; and must not be made to depend on human disputations.[4] But he did not persist in declining this invitation, if indeed he was serious in declining it at all ; and perhaps he might foresee that the bishops would never allow the matter to come to a dispute between him and Abelard. Many of the dialectic theologians attended this synod. It was a contest not barely between two indi-

[1] De quibus timeo, ne sicut monstruosi sunt nominis, sic etiam monstruosi sint dogmatis.

[2] Sicut dicunt, oderunt lucem nec etiam quaesita inveniuntur.

[3] In the third account of Bernard's life (c. v, § 11), it is related that, by his mild and amiable language, he had already brought Abelard to that state, that he had retired into himself, and promised, according to Bernard's opinion, to correct everything in his works. But this saying of an enthusiastic admirer cannot pass for credible testimony. The French bishops, it is true, mentioned to the pope, that Bernard had often endeavored *privatim*, to set Abelard right; but they by no means mention any such promise given by the latter, to which he had been unfaithful; but they report, what is in itself more credible, that he felt himself hurt by those suggestions

[4] Ep. 189.

viduals, but between two opposite directions of the theological spirit, and both parties were eagerly watching for the issue. Though Bernard's zeal in this affair sprung from a purely Christian interest, yet his mode of procedure seems not to have been so wholly unobjectionable; as, indeed, the zeal of polemical controversy but rarely knows how to preserve itself altogether pure. While his object was to procure the condemnation of Abelard at the council, he professed nothing but that charity which seeks the recovery of a brother in error; yet, under the cloak of this sacred name, he scattered seeds of hatred. In the name of Christian love he called on the people, in his sermons, to pray for Abelard's conversion, but at the same time stirred up the popular fury against him as a godless heretic, presenting him in this light before men who were incapable of understanding a single one of the complaints brought against him, and before whom he could not defend himself. With good reason, perhaps, might the youthful Berengar, who warmly stood forth as a witness and advocate in defence of his teacher Abelard, attach to such conduct the suspicion of hypocrisy, a sin which is so very apt to mix in, even when they are unconscious of it, with the polemics of *pious* men, and *not of such only*. With good reason might he tell Bernard, that Christian charity would have rather prompted him to pray for Abelard in silence.[1] Although the satirical account which Abelard's enthusiastic disciple has given of this council is not to be implicitly relied on, yet this much of truth doubtless lies at the bottom of it, that the assembly was one incapable of entering into a calm investigation. More partial to the general views and spirit of Bernard than to the opposite, they were easily governed by his authority. The propositions of Abelard, as stated to them by him, were soon condemned as heretical. On the next day, however, Abelard was asked whether he acknowledged that such propositions had been advanced by him, whether, acknowledging them to be his, he was ready to defend or to correct them. But as Abelard had no reason to expect a calm trial from men who, without hearing what he had to say, had already pronounced sentence of condemnation on the propositions attributed to him, he did not attempt replying to these interrogatories, but appealed to the pope; most probably relying on his pupils or on the friends of his school, amongst the cardinals. Now it was not necessary, it is true,[2] that all further proceedings of the council against him should be arrested by this appeal. According to the old ecclesiastical laws, and according to the principles of the Gallican church, they were not required to acknowledge as

[1] The words of Berengar in his tract in defence of Abelard: Concionabaris ad populum, ut orationem funderet ad Deum pro eo, interius autem disponebas eum proscribendum ab orbe Christiano. Quid vulgus faceret? Quid vulgus oraret, quum pro quo esset orandum nesciret? Tu vir Dei, qui miracula feceras, qui ad pedes Jesu cum Maria sedebas, purissimum sacrae orationis thus coram supernis obtutibus adolere deberes, ut reus tuus Petrus resipisceret.

[2] The council contradicts itself, in saying of Abelard, in its letter to the pope (ep. 337): Visus diffidere et subterfugere, respondere noluit, sed quamvis libera sibi daretur audientia, tutumque locum et aequos haberet judices, — and yet declaring that Abelard's pretended theses had already been condemned the day before.

of any validity an appeal made before judgment was pronounced, from a tribunal to which the appellant himself had first applied.[1] They concluded, however, to follow the custom which then prevailed, and which was favored by the Roman court, according to which appeals to Rome were to be admitted without limitation. It was necessary, in fact to avoid everything that might tend to favor his cause at the Roman court, where Abelard was not without his friends; and therefore, both parties had recourse to the pope. The council addressed him a letter, in which they complained, that not alone by students in the schools, but publicly, in all places, disputes were held upon the Trinity.[2] They besought the pope to confirm their sentence of condemnation on the propositions alleged to have been advanced by Abelard, of which, however, they sent him but a portion;[3] that he would pass sentence against all who persisted in obstinately defending them; that he would condemn Abelard's writings,[4] command him to be silent, and forbid him for the future either to lecture or to write.[5] The abbot of Clairvaux himself, also wrote a private letter to the pope, to which he added a list of the propositions of Abelard found to be heretical, together with a full exposition of his principal errors. He says of him, that, wishing to explain everything on grounds of reason, even that which is beyond reason, he acted as contrary to reason as he did to faith; for what was more contrary to reason, than for one to attempt with reason to go beyond reason; and what more contrary to faith, than to refuse to believe that which is unattainable by reason?[6] In opposition to Abelard, who applied[7] to that blind faith which is not the result of examination, the words of the Preacher (c. 19), Bernard affirms, that Solomon says this, not with reference to faith in God, but with reference to men's credulity in their relations to one another; for pope Gregory the Great (H. xxvi, in Evang.) says, the faith that reposes on arguments of reason has no merit whatever; while he praises the apostles, who followed our Lord at the bidding of a word. The disciples were blamed, because it was so difficult for them to believe. Zacharias was punished (Luke i,) because he required reasons for believing. He referred, moreover, to the example of faith in Mary and in Abraham. But it is evident, from the explanations already given, that Abelard also acknowledged the faith that proceeds from a submission of the heart to be acceptable to God, and indispensable to true piety. It was only to the preparatory inquiry, which precedes such faith, to the way and mode of attaining to such faith, suited to certain individualities of character, and to the intellec-

[1] To this the words refer in the letter of the council: Licet appellatio ista minus canonica videretur.

[2] Cum per totam fere Galliam in civitatibus, vicis et castellis, a scholaribus non solum intra scholas, sed etiam triviatim nec a literatis et provectis tantum, sed a pueris et simplicibus aut certe stultis de sancta trinitate disputaretur.

[3] Quaedam, ut per haec audita reliqui corpus operis facilius aestimetis.

[4] Without any accurate designation of the works intended, with the altogether arbitrary explanation: Libros ejus perverso sine dubio dogmate respersos condemnaret.

[5] Ep. 337.

[6] Quid enim magis contra rationem, quam ratione rationem conari transcendere? Et quid magis contra fidem, quam credere nolle, quicquid non possis ratione attingere.

[7] See page 375.

tion (*intellectus*) that grew out of such faith, that the controversy related. Yet Bernard attributed the errors of Abelard to his desire of comprehending that which is above reason, and reserved to faith alone.

Moreover, he accused him of saying that faith was mere opinion; of representing it as something quite unsettled and wavering. He here took the liberty of converting his own inferences into actual positions of Abelard, for the purpose of showing that, by Abelard's doctrine, the whole foundation of Christian faith and Christian hope was left tottering. But we have already seen that, in the place referred to, Abelard is only speaking of the scientific mode of apprehending a dogma, not of the essential contents of the faith itself. Bernard, on the other hand, says: "Far be it from us to suppose that anything in our faith, or in our hope, depends on doubtful opinions or conjectures, that all does not much rather repose on a sure and settled foundation of truth, as it has been established by God's own declarations, by miracles, the birth of the Virgin, the blood of the Saviour, and the majesty of his resurrection. To this is added, finally, the internal witness of the Holy Spirit, which testifies with our spirit, that we are the children of God. Who, then, can call faith an opinion, but he who has not as yet received that spirit, or who has no knowledge of the gospel, or who holds it to be a fable?" He refers to the passage in Heb. 11: 1, acknowledging that Abelard also had made use of those words. The term *substance*, in this passage, he says, denotes something certain and fixed, as opposed to the unsettledness of human opinion.

Bernard wrote also to the cardinals in Rome several letters, in which he directed their attention to the dangers threatening the simplicity and purity of the faith, and complained that Abelard felt confident he had followers in the Roman court itself.

But how very far Abelard was from any intention of doing injury to the Christian faith, appears evident from his own declarations, made during the time of these disputes to the abbess Heloise, who seems to have been disturbed by the reports concerning his erroneous doctrines. He guards himself against the eulogies of those who expressed a high estimation of his intellect, but not of his faith, — who recognized in him the philosopher, but not the Christian. Christianity, the Bible, he here declares to be the matters of highest interest for him, beside which all others fall into comparative insignificance;[1] for to him Christ is the sole foundation of salvation. And he then proceeds to lay down a full confession of his orthodoxy.[2]

In those hopes which he had placed on his friends at Rome, Abelard found himself wholly disappointed. The influence of Bernard there was too powerful, to allow any chance for the adherents of Abelard to

[1] Nolo sic esse philosophus, ut recalcitrem Paulo. Non sic esse Aristoteles, ut secludar a Christo, non enim aliud nomen est sub coelo, in quo oporteat me salvum fieri.

[2] Abelard's disciple Berengar has cited this letter in his tract written in Abelard's defence. Opp. p. 308.

effect anything against it; and we must admit, also, that his peculiar theological bent was not of a character suited to fall in with the reigning spirit of the church in these times. If it was not checked, if it should be allowed freely to develop itself, it would be continually coming more and more into collision with the church system. Moreover, the connection between Abelard's cause and that of Arnold of Brescia, could not fail of contributing to make the tendency which he represented appear suspicious, and fraught with danger. When he arrived at Lyons, on his way to Rome, the decision which had already been given there reached him. The pope issued two briefs to the archbishops of Rheims, and of Sens, and to the abbot Bernard. In one of them, he declared the propositions of Abelard, that had been sent to him, and — which really, for an ecclesiastical decision, was extremely loose and indefinite language — all his perverse doctrines which were not specified however, to be condemned; on himself, as a heretic, was imposed the duty of perpetual silence. Sentence of excommunication was pronounced on all his adherents. By a second writing, Innocent bestowed on the three persons above mentioned, full powers to confine Abelard, and Arnold of Brescia, in separate monasteries, and to burn all their writings. But the forsaken Abelard found refuge with Peter, the venerable abbot of Cluny. This person, who, above all other pious men, was distinguished for gentleness, and an open sense for every good trait in others, highly respected Abelard's zeal for science, and his great talents, and could discern the marks of piety, even in an individuality of character so different from his own. He was desirous of making the mental gifts and scientific attainments of the great scholar useful to his monks, while at the same time he provided, in their midst, a secure and peaceful resting-place for the evening of his unsettled and distracted life. With the assistance of the abbot of Citeaux, he effected a reconciliation between Bernard and Abelard.[1] He procured for him the pope's absolution, and adopted him amongst his monks at Cluny.

Abelard afterwards published a Confession, which he thus begins: "Everything, however well said, may be perverted. I myself, though I have composed but a few treatises, and those of small extent, have not been able to escape censure; though in truth, in the things on account of which I have been violently attacked, I can (as God knows) see no fault whatsoever on my part; and if any such fault can be discovered, I have no disposition to defend it obstinately. I have perhaps, from mistake, written many things not after the right manner; but I call God to witness that, in the things for which I am accused, I have maintained nothing out of a malicious will, or out of pride. In my lectures, I have said many things before many. Publicly, I have spoken what seemed to me calculated for the edification of faith, or of morals; and what I have written, I have cheerfully communicated to all, that I might have them for my judges, and not for my pupils." Many of the propositions found to be offensive, he

[1] Lib. iv, ep. 4

explained in a milder sense; with regard to others, he protested against the conclusions derived from them, which he would not admit. In the history of particular dogmas, we shall compare Abelard's original teachings with the explanations presented in this apology. It is our intention to cite here only his explanation with regard to the above-presented ethical propositions. "Sins committed through ignorance, amount to guilt, particularly when, from negligence, we know not that which we ought to know. I affirm that the crucifiers of Christ committed the greatest crime. I affirm that all who equally love God, and their neighbor, — all who are equally good, — are equals in merit, and nothing of merit is lost in the sight of God, when a good will fails of an opportunity to execute its purposes." It is plain, that the ethical principles before presented, are here also held fast by him; only, they are more cautiously expressed, and guarded against the extravagant statements to which he had given occasion. In general, we find no evidence that a change had really taken place in his mode of thinking, or that he was visited, as some asserted, with remorse, on account of the course he had pursued. The contrary rather may be gathered from a larger work (under the title *Apologia*), written in justification of himself; where he defends his doctrines, at length, against the charges of Bernard, and accuses the latter of misrepresenting and perverting them; — saying of him, that he thrust himself forward as a judge on matters which he did not understand.[1]

How far Abelard was in spirit from yielding to his opponents, how completely, on the contrary, he triumphed over them, in his own consciousness, might be gathered, moreover, from a dialogue that appeared under his name, "On the Supreme Good,"[2] in which a philosopher, a Jew, and a Christian are the interlocutors,—for this production must have been composed after the events just described; and yet we find in it the same bold assertions respecting the relation of *fides* to *ratio*, as in the works already cited, and they are carried out with the same degree of acuteness. It may admit of a question, however, whether this production did not proceed from some one of his enthusiastic and free-spirited scholars.[3]

[1] See the Disputatio anonymi against Abelard, in the Bibliotheca Cisterciensis, t. iv. f. 239. Here the author objects to him, quod abbatem literatissimum et, quod majus est, religiosissimum vocat inexpertum artis illius, quae magistra est disserendi.

[2] Petri Abaelardi Dialogus inter philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum, e codicibus bibliothecae Caesareae Vindobonensis ed. Rheinwald. Berolini, 1831.

[3] In the doctrine presented in this Dialogue we find nothing which does not agree perfectly with Abelard's mode of thinking. All the propositions scattered through his writings which have been cited, that gave offence to his opponents, were here introduced in the course of the conversation; but still, it cannot be gathered from this, that he himself was the author of it: for he had ready-witted scholars, who had made his doctrines and his mode of thinking wholly their own, could present them in a talented manner, and in their youthful pride rose, still more than their master, above all regard to circumstances; as, for instance, that clergyman Pierre Berenger, the bold and witty defender of Abelard. Now it is to be remarked, that there are preserved in different libraries (See Hist. lit. de la France, t. xii, p. 132), two manuscript works under the name of Abelard, a dialogue of a philosopher with a Jew, and a dialogue of a philosopher with a Christian. If they are rightly ascribed to him, then these two separate dialogues are works distinct from the one published by Rheinwald. Perhaps the two former pieces formed the basis of the last; and if

After Abelard had labored for a while among the monks of Cluny, his activity was arrested by an illness, and the abbot Peter, whose esteem and love for him had been increased by personal intercourse, removed him to an appropriate place for the recovery of his health, in the priory of St. Marcel, at Chalons on the Saone; where he enjoyed the benefit of careful nursing; and here he died, on the 21st of April, A. D. 1142. The abbot Peter drew up, in a letter to the abbess Heloise,[1] a report of his truly Christian walk during the last years of his life, and of the devout manner in which he died. He calls him the servant of Christ, the true Christian philosopher.[2]

An important sign of the times, an event attended with grave consequences for the next succeeding course of the development of theology, was such a termination of this controversy between the representatives of the antagonistic tendencies of spirit. At the same time, however, it should not be so understood, as if the whole tendency of the dialectic, speculative theology had expired in the person of Abelard. Even Abelard's opponents themselves were by no means in favor of condemning this tendency in itself considered. Even Bernard recognized its rights; and this tendency of spirit was too closely inwoven with the very being of the times to be suppressed by magisterial denunciations. One point only was decided, that this tendency should be checked and moderated; that the rational element should not have an undue preponderance to the prejudice of the ecclesiastical and practical direction; that it should not be rent from its connection with the other spiritual forces that determined the character of the age. Men in whom was to be found this harmonious union of spiritual elements, stood high in the general esteem, and in intimate connection with Bernard himself, when Abelard was condemned; and their orthodoxy was disputed by no one.

Amongst these was Hugo, a canonical of the church of St. Victor at Paris. He was born at Ypres, towards the close of the eleventh century, and came, when a boy, to Halberstadt, where his uncle was

the two single dialogues came from Abelard, this may not have been the case with the dialogue which was formed out of the blending together of those two. In addition to this, we find, in the collective edition of Abelard's works, p. 326, after several letters of Berengar, something that does not belong to those letters, the fragment of a dialogue containing Abelard's ideas concerning the relationship betwixt the ancient philosophy and Christianity, representing the Christians as disciples of the Logos, as the genuine logicians, and Christianity as the true logic, — a dialogue between P. A. (Peter Abelard,) and P (perhaps Peter Berengar). Perhaps this dialogue may be one of the two that still remain hidden in manuscript; and this clue, if followed out, might lead us to consider Berengar as the author of the dialogue here mentioned, perhaps also of the one published under the name of Abelard. It still remains to institute a faithful comparison between the style of this dialogue and the style of Abelard and of Berengar.

[1] Lib. iv, ep. 21.

[2] He says of him: Qui singulari scientiae magisterio toti paene orbi terrarum notus et ubique famosus erat, in illius disci pulatu, qui dixit: discite a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde, mitis et humilis perseverans, ad ipsum, ut dignum est credere. sic transivit. — In the inscription, which he placed on his tomb: —

Gallorum Socrates, Plato maximus Hesperiarum,
Noster Aristoteles, logicis, quicunque fuerunt,
Aut par aut melior, studiorum cognitus orbi
Princeps, ingenio varius, subtilis et acer,
Omnia vi superans rationis et arte loquendi
Abaelardus erat. Sed tunc magis omnia vicit
Cum Cluniacensem monachum moremque professus
Ad Christi veram transivit philosophiam

archdeacon. He himself records how hard it was for him, in his boyish years, to exchange the poor little cottage in which he was born, for a stately dwelling in the land of strangers.[1] Brought up in the abbey of Hamersleben, he was received in the year 1118 into the foundation of regular canonicals, bearing the name of St. Victor, at Paris, and contributed greatly to the high renown of this establishment. In him, we see the representative of a school distinguished in the twelfth century for its hearty religious spirit and its tendency to practical reform; a school which, though it united more or less the mystico-contemplative with the speculative element, yet constantly kept up the contest with the predominating dialectic tendency. Hugo entitled himself to the honor of being called the second Augustin.[2] If, in Abelard, we see those spiritual tendencies of his times, which had been harmoniously united by Anselm, brought into conflict with each other, we see them once more reconciled in Hugo; but with this difference, that in him the dialectical element is not so strong as it was in Anselm. In his doctrinal investigations, he often has reference to, and contends against Abelard, though, without mentioning his name.[3]

The empirical department of knowledge generally, and in theology the study of the older church teachers, and of the Bible, was by him made specially prominent in opposition to the one-sided speculative and all-innovating tendency. Thus, for example, in his Rules of Study, written for monks,[4] he declaims against the pride of those one-sided *a priori* methods, which, neglecting the empirical sciences, begin at once with philosophy.[5] "It is impossible," he says, "to arrive at anything great, without commencing with the little. It is impossible to become a grammarian, without beginning with the alphabet." To such methods, he opposes the one he had followed himself; — he relates how, from his youth up, he had striven to learn everything that came within his reach.[6] His principle was, "Study everything; thou wilt afterwards see that nothing is superfluous." He speaks against those who, if they could boast of having heard this or that great man, thought they were already something great themselves; those who talked of the Holy Scriptures as if they were so simple that it needed

[1] In his Eruditio didascalica, lib. vii, c. xx: Ego a puero exulavi et scio, quo moerore animus arctum aliquando pauperis tugurii fundum deserat, qua libertate postea marmoreos lares et tecta laqueata despiciat.

[2] Qui secundus Augustinus in scientia dictus est. Thomas Cantiprat. lib. ii, c. xvi. Duaci, 1627. p. 215.

[3] The principal works of his that belong here, are the *De sacramentis fidei* and the *Summa sententiarum*. That the *Tractatus theologicus*, ascribed to Hildebert, archbishop of Mans or Tours, is but a fragment from the latter work, and that the former therefore deserves no place among the scholastic theologians among whom he has been named, must be clear to any one who compares the two works. Dr. Liebner, the author of the fine monography on Hugo, is entitled to the praise of having, by his thorough analysis, caused this to be generally acknowledged. See Studien und Kritiken, Jahrg. 1831, 2tes Heft.

[4] Eruditio didascalica.

[5] Lib. vi, c. iii: Scio quosdam, qui statim philosophari volunt, fabulas pseudoapostolis relinquendas ajunt.

[6] The object for which he enters into these details, in the third chapter of the above-mentioned work, is, ut ostendam tibi, illum incedere aptissime, qui incedit ordinate, neque ut quidam, qui, dum magnum saltum facere volunt, in praecipitium incidunt.

no teaching to understand them. He says of these, that, under the specious name of simplicity, they virtually denied the profoundness of meaning in the Holy Scriptures.[1] He divides those who occupied themselves with the study of the Bible, into three classes; the first, comprising such as were aiming in this way to acquire for themselves honor and riches; whose disposition was a most depraved and deplorable one. Next, those who search the sacred volume for the wonderful and mysterious,[2] instead of that which would tend to their salvation; who gaze with astonishment on the revelation of God's almighty power, instead of contemplating with love the revelation of his divine compassion; who are impelled only by an aimless thirst for knowledge. Of such he says, they treated God's revelations as an exhibition; and, like people going to a show, went to them for entertainment and not to obtain nourishment for the heart. The third class embraced those, whom alone he passes without censure, men who study the sacred Scriptures that they may be able to give a reason for their faith, to refute gainsayers, to instruct the ignorant, and that they may be inflamed themselves with a deeper love, the more profoundly they search into the divine mysteries. And so he always ends in speaking of theological study, with a reference to the practical purpose to be answered and the practical need to be satisfied.

Hugo appears as a strenuous advocate for the independence of the religious sphere, of religious faith, as a province lying above the worldly consciousness and the worldly tendencies of the soul. He uttered the profoundest remarks respecting this sacred province in the human spirit, this spot in it consecrated to the revelation of God. His ideas are as follows: "Three eyes have been given to man: the eye of sense, for the sensible objects lying without him; another eye, whereby the soul is enabled to know itself, and what is within itself, — the eye of reason; a third eye, within itself, to perceive God and divine things, — the eye of contemplation." We have here important distinctions between the sensuous consciousness of the world, the rational consciousness of self, and the consciousness of God. "But, by reason of sin, the eye of contemplation is extinguished, that of reason obscured. Now, as the eye of contemplation, whereby man might come to the knowledge of God and of divine things, no longer dwells in him, therefore faith must take its place." Adopting the definition of faith in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he remarks: "Faith is called the substance of things invisible, because that which, as yet, is not an object of open vision, is by faith, in a certain sense, made present to the soul, — actually dwells in it."[3] Nor is there anything else whereby the things of God could be demonstrated, since they are higher than all others; nothing resembles them which could serve us as a bridge to that higher knowledge. But a credible witness is

[1] L. c. lib. iii, c. xiv.

[2] Quos audire verba Dei et opera ejus discere delectat, non quia salutifera, sed quia mirabilia sunt. Scrutari arcana et inaudita cognoscere volunt, multa scire et nihil facere.

[3] Fides substantia illorum, quia per solam fidem subsistunt nunc in nobis.

the experience of the faithful in all ages, who would not have sacrificed their all to the earnest desire after eternal life, if they had not had an experience of its reality that transcends our knowledge. In faith resides a certainty, which is more than opinion, yet falls short of absolute knowledge. Two things must meet together in faith: knowledge and feeling, or the bent of the affections (*affectus*), — objective and subjective elements. There is a conviction, then, which is determined by feeling.[1] Faith cannot exist, therefore, wholly without knowledge; but it is here necessary to distinguish two kinds of knowledge, — a preliminary one, and a knowledge that is first evolved out of faith. Faith presupposes the *general knowledge* of the *being* of its object; but only from faith proceeds the knowledge of the *quality* of the object, which knowledge will be perfect in the heavenly world."[2] Hence the faith of the theologian and that of the logician stand, he says, in an inverse order to each other; for in the latter, faith proceeds first from the understanding (*intellectus*); in the former, the understanding proceeds from faith. Hence, in the latter, that is the original which in the former is the derived; and in the former, that is the original which in the latter is the derived. In the one case, feeling is the original, and knowledge by reason the derived; in the other, knowledge on rational grounds comes first, and the feeling of conviction, of certainty, of rational satisfaction, that proceeds from and accompanies it, is the derived. "The merit of faith (*meritum fidei*) consists in the fact that our conviction is determined by the affections, when no adequate knowledge is yet present. By faith, we render ourselves worthy of knowledge; as perfect knowledge is the final reward of faith in the life eternal. To this knowledge by faith corresponds the way in which God reveals himself in creation, neither entirely concealing, nor yet wholly unveiling himself. Were the former the case, there would be no guilt in unbelief. Were the latter the case, there would be no merit in faith. The merit is based, in fact, on that bias of the will whereby the heart turns away from the world to God, and resigns itself to the godlike.[3] Inasmuch then as in faith, knowledge and feeling (*affectus*) should meet together, their relation to each other may differ in different cases. Knowledge and feeling may both be present in equal measure, or one preponderate over the other. But the *worth* (*meritum*) of faith is determined chiefly by the degree of feeling. Hence our Lord says to the Canaanitish woman, whose knowledge was small, but whose trust was great: "Woman, great is thy faith." He distinguishes among believers the following gradations. First are those who, in believing, simply follow their pious feelings, without being able to state the grounds on

[1] Fides in affectu habet substantiam, quia affectus ipse fides est, in cognitione habet materiam, quia de illo et ad illud, quod in cognitione est, fides est credere igitur in affectu est, quod vere creditur in cognitione est.

[2] Ad hoc, ut fides actu habeatur de aliquo, primum oportet scire, quod ipsum sit, secundo credere, tertia intelligere, quid ipsum sit, quod plene erit in patria.

[3] Hence this definition of faith: Voluntaria quaedam certitudo absentium supra opinionem et infra scientiam constituta Misc. i, 18.

which they believe. Next, those who are able to state the grounds which determine them to believe as they do. Finally, those who, by purity of heart, begin already to have some inward taste of that which they believe,[1] and by purification of the mind rise to certainty. The gradual progress of the Christian life, up to this stage of it, he describes as follows: "By the devotion that proceeds from faith, the believer's heart is purified, so that, with pure heart, he begins already to have some foretaste of that which, with faith and devotion, he longs to know. The pure heart daily makes progress through its experiences of a daily intercourse with God,[2] and it attains thereby to such a certainty as to begin already to have God present by contemplation; so that in no way, even though a whole world full of miracles should interpose, could it be drawn away again from its faith in him, and its love to him."[3] We find here described such an immediate certainty of Christian consciousness as no longer needs outward support, inasmuch as it carries the evidence of the truth in itself,[4] — a certainty superior to all proof from single miracles; whence we may infer that Hugo was far from attributing an undue importance to miracles, singly contemplated.

According as theologians placed the essence of religion in knowledge, or in the life of the heart, the affections, — a difference which here lay at the bottom, at least, though no one may have thought of accounting to himself for such opposite modes of apprehension — accordingly would they be inclined to decide the question, as to how far a knowledge of the articles of faith was requisite to salvation. They who started from the position that the essence of religion consists in knowledge, were driven by their own principle to strain the requisitions with regard to the extent of the knowledge necessary in order to salvation, to the highest point. To these Hugo would necessarily be opposed, since he placed the essence of faith in the affections. Therefore he declared that, in regard to the essence of true faith, much more depended on the degree of devotion than on the extent of knowledge:[5] for divine grace did not look at the amount of knowledge united with the faith, but at the degree of devotion with which that which constituted the object of faith was loved.

On this question arose a remarkable controversy, which, in a time of more cultivated and prevailingly scientific reflection, when theological antagonisms could have been permitted to express themselves more fully out, and to unfold themselves with all their consequences into clearer consciousness, would have led to important oppositions in the mode of judging of doctrinal differences, and in the interpretation of

[1] Puritate cordis et munda conscientia interius jam gustare incipiunt, quod fide credunt.

[2] Munda conscientia invisibilibus documentis et secreta et familiari visitatione de Deo suo quotidie eruditur.

[3] Ut nulla jam ratione, ab ejus fide et dilectione, etiamsi totus mundus in miracula vertatur, avelli queat.

[4] He therefore describes this stage as a per veritatem apprehendere.

[5] On the other hand, speaking of the advocates of the opposite opinion, he says: Beatificandam putant hi fidem veram in multitudine cognitionis potius, quam in magnitudine devotionis.

the Old Testament.[1] It was the men of excessive strictness in doctrine, the hyperorthodox, as Hugo calls them,[2] who, without paying any regard to the different grades of mental cultivation, required of all alike, that claimed to be called believers, the same measure and the same accuracy in the knowledge of the articles of faith, and supposed that the like was possessed also by the good men of the Old Testament, though in their case the knowledge had reference to things that could only be fulfilled in the future. The course taken by Hugo to refute this opinion evinces both the penetration and profoundness of his views, and the liberality of his mind. "From this supposition," he remarks, "it would follow that, in the times of the Old Testament, either the number of those that obtained salvation was too small, or the number of those that were specially enlightened, too great. For we must either suppose that only the few who, as prophets, were enabled by special illumination to look clearly into the future, were saved; or else we must suppose that all the pious of those times enjoyed the same special prophetic illumination. The last supposition would tend most to the honor of divine grace; but it would be contradictory to the position which the New Testament holds in relation to the Old: since it would follow from it that, instead of the New Testament possessing the advantage over the Old, of more abounding grace, the Old Testament would possess that advantage over the New. The times of the new covenant would not be distinguished, as they are declared to be, above those of the old, by the general outpouring of the Holy Ghost; on the contrary, there would be a withholding of that fulness of the Spirit that had been poured out in the times of the old covenant. Paul would have boasted, without good reason, that he had neither received the gospel of man, nor by man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, if such an illumination had already before his own times been bestowed on the entire people of God. Christ himself would have had no good reason for saying, that among them that are born of women there had not risen a greater than John the Baptist. John fell once more into doubt, whether or no Jesus was the Messiah; while on the other hand thousands, that lived under the Old Testament dispensation, must, according to the supposition in question, have possessed on all points a knowledge amounting to cer-

[1] Hugo had already expressed his views on this point, in a letter addressed to Bernard of Clairvaux; and had requested the latter to give his own opinion on this and several other points. Bernard replies, in his Tractatus ad Hugonem, p. ii, opusc. 10 (according to Mabillon, c. iii), and declares his entire agreement with Hugo. It is singular, however, to observe the verbal coincidence between Bernard's remarks and Hugo's exposition, lib. i, De sacramentis fidei, p. x, c. vi. As Bernard himself says: Ad refellendum tu tanta in tua epistola posuisse videris, ut nil addendum penitus putem et paene, quid addi possit, non inveniam, so it is the less possible to suppose that Hugo should have inserted so much important matter from Bernard's letter into his own exposition, word for word. Besides, Hugo's originality of mind renders this very improbable. But neither again is it quite conceivable, that Bernard should have transcribed from Hugo's letter, word for word. It may be questioned, therefore, whether Bernard's letter may not have received additions from some other hand.

[2] He classes them with those, qui quasi quadam pietate impii in Deum efficiuntur et dum ultra id, quod in veritate est, sentiunt, in ipsam veritatem offendunt.

tainty. With what propriety could Christ, on this supposition, have said to his disciples: 'Blessed are your eyes, for they see,' thus placing them so far above the enlightened men of the Old Testament (Luke x, John xv)? By this he certainly intimates that they were to know, more clearly and more fully, those things which under the Old Testament had only been obscurely and imperfectly divined.[1] Nor can this be supposed to refer to the mere outward beholding of our Lord with the eye of sense, or the mere outward hearing of his words with the ear of sense: for what need of this, if they were already fully instructed in all things by the illumination of the Spirit? especially as our Lord says: 'The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit that quickeneth.' The intuition of the Spirit, then, is more than bare outward perception. Now, if the prophets and the enlightened men of the Old Testament were not all enabled alike to understand all things, but some understood more, others less, according to the measure bestowed on them by the Spirit, and that without detracting from their holiness and perfection, then how much more might the simple ones among the pious remain ignorant of the time, the form, the way, and the order in which redemption was to be accomplished, without prejudice to their salvation, if they only persevered in faith and hope to the end?" Hugo adverted to the different measure of knowledge which, without impairing the unity of faith, might exist among Christians of the same period. "How many there are," he says, "among Christian people, even at the present time, who firmly believe in a future world and an eternal life, and fervently long after it, but are still very far from being able to form the remotest conception of what it consists in. In like manner, before the appearance of Christ, there were many that firmly believed on the Almighty God who promised them salvation, and that hoped for salvation from Him, and through this faith and this hope actually obtained salvation, although they ever remained in ignorance respecting the time, the way, and the order, in which the promised salvation would be accomplished. The very apostles themselves found it extremely difficult to understand how the sufferings of Christ were necessary to man's salvation: and therefore it was, that what Christ said to them on this subject continued for so long a time to be obscure to them. Accordingly, it is the same fundamental article of faith, virtually including in it all the rest, on the embracing of which salvation has ever depended. The matter of this faith was ever the same; it became more clearly and fully unfolded, but it never changed.[2] Before the law, faith was exercised in God as Creator, and salvation was expected from him; but through whom, and in what way this salvation was to be brought about, was unknown to believers, if we except a few to whom it was made known by a special gift of illumination. Under the law, the Saviour was already promised as a person: but whether this

[1] Ut clarius largiusque perciperent, quod vix tenuiter obscureque praesenserant.

[2] Crevit itaque per tempora fides in omnibus, ut major esset, sed mutata non est, ut alia esset.

person was to be a man, an angel, or God, was not yet revealed. Faith in God, as Creator and Redeemer, is the common ground of faith for all periods in the evolution of the kingdom of God, connected with which there may exist different measures of knowledge in different periods and among different classes of men in the same period. Still, the simple and the enlightened are bound together by the same faith."

In the controversy alluded to on a former page, concerning the nature of true love to God, Hugo endeavored to prepare the way for a better understanding of the matter, by introducing some just and well-considered distinctions: but here, too, he stood forth as the opponent of Abelard. After having laid it down that it was only necessary to love God in order to possess him, that God is always present to love,[1] he goes on to say: "But, perhaps, if thou lovest and servest God with a view to receive a reward from him, thou wilt be a hireling. So say certain foolish men, so foolish as not even to understand themselves.[2] We love and serve God, say they, but we seek no reward, lest we be hirelings; we do not ask, even, for himself. He will give if it pleases him; but we do not ask it. We love him with a simple, disinterested, childlike love. Listen, ye wise people! We love him, say they, but we ask not for him. We love him, that is, but we care nothing about him. I, as a man, would not desire to be so loved by you. If you so loved me as to care nothing about me, I should care nothing about your love. Consider whether that is worth offering to God which a man might rightly despise. People who talk thus, do not understand the nature of love. What else does loving mean than a desire to have what we love? A desire to have, not something other than the object of love, but that object itself, this is disinterested love. There is no love without longing after that which is the object of the love.[3] Shouldst thou hold eternal life itself to be other than the supreme good, which is God, and serve him in order to obtain that, it would be no pure service, no pure love."[4]

Here we cannot forbear to remark, that this view of disinterested love to God and eternal life, holding the exact mean betwixt a fleshly Eudemonism on the one hand, and the extravagance of a mysticism leading to self-annihilation, on the other, is to be found in one who, in respect to mental cultivation, certainly cannot be compared with either Abelard or Hugo, but belongs rather to the more narrow minds of his time, — Gerhoh, of Reichersberg. "Though God is loved and worshipped," says he, "yet is he not loved without reward, though he must be loved without respect to the reward.[5] True love neither is empty, nor yet seeks a reward, — for it seeks not its own; it lets men do everything out of freewill. True love is satisfied with itself; it

[1] Si amatur, habetur. Si diligitur, gustatur. Praesens est dilectioni.

[2] Stulti quidam et tam stulti, ut seipsos non intelligant.

[3] Qui hoc dicunt, virtutem dilectionis non intelligunt. Quid enim diligere, nisi ipsum velle habere. Non aliud ab ipso, sed ipsum, hoc est gratis. Alioquin non amares, si non desiderares.

[4] De sacramentis fidei, p. xiii, lib. ii, c viii.

[5] Non sine praemio diligitur Deus, etsi absque praemii sit intuitu diligendus.

has a reward, but it is just that which is the object of love."[1] After having declared himself opposed to the expectations of a sensuous Eudemonism, he goes on to say: "They who know that they are to find their satisfaction and their bliss in that eternal life, in that righteousness alone after which they now hunger, need not be hired by a reward to long after it, any more than a hungry man needs to be hired to eat, or a thirsty man to drink."[2] Those who seek eternal instead of temporal good in eternal life, but an eternal good that resembles temporal, he calls dreamers: "For in the kingdom of heaven nothing will be found like that which they dream about, — there, God will be all in all; the only cause of joy there will be God himself;"[3] a remarkable evidence, certainly, of the Christian spirit that animated the thinking of this period, when a man no better cultivated than we find this Gerhoh to have been, could still write after this fashion.

We see still another besides Hugo, who contrived to unite the dialectic bent of mind with the church theology, and who composed a work in this same spirit and according to this same method, on the system of faith, and who continued at the same time to be universally respected, namely, Robert Pull, or Pullein.[4] He taught, unmolested, at the university of Oxford, where he became chancellor. Pope Eugene the Third, wishing to secure the talents and character, which had been so well tried in the service of science, for the general guidance of the church, called him to Rome, in the capacity of cardinal and chancellor of the Roman church; and the abbot Bernard, who spoke of him as his old friend, and acknowledged his merits, called upon him, when he was elevated to this dignity, to do as much in the practical service of the church, as he had before done for theological culture.[5]

Somewhat later, however, the abbot Bernard fell into controversy with another representative of the dialectico-theological tendency. And, indeed, the subject was here an entirely different one. It did not involve in it an opposition of theological spirit so deeply seated as in the controversy between Bernard and Abelard; therefore the dispute did not possess the same objective interest. Even from his own point of view, Bernard needed not to see the great danger he thought he saw; nor would he have seen it, perhaps, if it had not been for various influences foreign from the matter itself. Gilbert de la Poree, archbishop of Poictiers, the person with whom this controversy broke out, was, by no means to be compared, as a bold and original thinker, with Abelard. He kept himself, together with his dialectic theology, within the

[1] Vacua namque vel infructuosa veracitas esse non potest nec tamen mercenaria est, quippe non quaerit quae sua sunt, sponte allicit et spontaneum facit. Verus amor seipso contentus est, habet praemium, sed quod amatur. We recognize here the verbal agreement with Bernard (see above p. 260), whose sayings Gerhoh doubtless had before him, or else recollected.

[2] Qui scientes in vita aeterna solius justitiae, quam nunc esuriunt, se deliciis fovendos et saturandos, non indigent praemiis conduci ad hanc appetendam et quaerendam, sicut nullus esuriens, ut comedat, nullus sitiens, ut bibat, conducitur.

[3] In the above-cited Commentary on the Psalms, f. 895.

[4] His Sententiae, in eight parts.

[5] Hactenus quippe eruditioni multorum fideliter et utiliter instabas, coelo et terra testibus, sed jam tempus faciendi Domino, ne patiaris, quod in te est, dissipari ab impiis, legem ejus. Ep. 362.

common limits. He followed that view of the relation of "reason" to "faith," which had prevailed since the time of Abelard; doubtless he was aware, also, of the limits of "reason,"[1] though the little we know of him would lead us to regard him rather as a dry dialectician, than as one possessed of the profound intellect and heart of an Anselm. Abelard, his dialectical opponent, had already, at the council of Sens, forewarned him, in the well-known words of Horace: "Nam tua res agitur, paries quum proximus ardet,"[2] of the danger to which he also was exposed as a representative of the same dialectical theology.

Two of his clergy, some time after this, brought a complaint against him before pope Eugene the Third as holding heretical opinions on the doctrine of the Trinity; and Bernard put himself at the head of the party opposed to him. But Bernard could not force the matter through here so easily as he had done in the controversy with Abelard. At the council of Rheims, in 1148, where pope Eugene the Third was personally present and heard the representations of Gilbert and his opponents, opinions were divided. Gilbert found friends among the cardinals, who were not pleased at the dependence of the pope on his old teacher, a French abbot. A confession drawn up by Bernard, in opposition to Gilbert's errors, could not obtain the authority of a confession publicly recognized by the church; and Gilbert had the advantage at least so far as this, that he was permitted, after submitting to the pope's decision, to return home with honor to his diocese, where he ever afterwards remained unmolested,— a partial triumph of the dialectic school, — an evidence that this tendency could no longer be entirely banished. And about this time appeared an individual by whom a reconciliation was effected between the two conflicting tendencies of the church, and of speculation, in a form which came, afterwards, to be more and more generally recognized. This was Peter Lombard of Novara, whose theological studies at the Parisian university had met the approbation of Bernard himself, and who in the year 1159 was made bishop of Paris, soon after which, in 1160, he died. Following a method which had long been practised, but which he applied more skilfully than others, he composed a manual of doctrine, under the title of *Quatuor libri sententiarum*. By laying for his foundation a collection of sayings from the older church teachers, particularly Augustin and Gregory the Great, he met the wishes of the reigning church party; and by the great variety of questions which he propounded, by his method of arranging his whole matter according to certain general grounds of distribution, of citing opposite opinions from the fathers, which he endeavored to reconcile by means of accurate distinctions, he presented a point of attachment for those inclined to dialectics. This method, and its in-

[1] As may be gathered from the words with which he concludes his Commentary on the first book of Boethius de trinitate; for, in explaining here the sense of Boethius, he no doubt expresses also his own opinion, that the rationum argumenta are merely subservient to the Catholicorum sententiae sponte, id est sine rationum argumentis firmissimae. Quod si humanae naturae infirmitas nequivit adscendere ultra se, ut scilicet ineffabilia ex rationum locis ostenderet, quantum intelligentiae imbecillitas subtrahit, tantum incomprehensibilibus semper haerentis voluntatis vota supplebunt.

[2] Horat. lib. i, ep. 18, v. 84.

genious application; the rich store of matter reduced to a compact brevity; the sobriety and moderation of the theological spirit therein exhibited, procured for this work an ever-increasing popularity, so that it became the standard manual of the following centuries, and was adopted by the most distinguished teachers, who wrote commentaries upon it.[1] The school of Peter Lombard was continued by his disciple, Peter of Poictiers,[2] chancellor of the university of Paris; yet even this school had still to pass through many contests, partly with the ecclesiastical and partly with the mystical tendency.

As representatives of the first-mentioned form of opposition, we may notice particularly Gerhoh of Reichersberg, and Walter of Mauretania. Gerhoh, who was so zealous in opposing abuses in the church, declared no less earnestly against those who passed over from the worldly sciences to theology, and applied a worldly sense to the judgment of divine things. Though they cited many passages from the Holy Scriptures, yet these disciples of antichrist were strangers to that spirit of truth which teaches the disciples all truth.[3] Walter of Mauretania, at that time prior over the foundation of the regular canonicals of St. Victor at Paris, was, indeed, as we have seen, one of Abelard's first antagonists; but he departed farther, as he grew older, from that moderation which he had shown at first. When Peter of Poictiers was the only living representative of the dialectico-theological tendency of the twelfth century, Walter wrote against it a work placing together in the same category Abelard and Gilbert of Poictiers, Peter Lombard and Peter of Poictiers, little as the two latter could be associated, as men of the same spirit, with the two former. This was his work, *Contra quatuor Galliae Labyrinthos*. He maintained that the course pursued by these theologians, of applying dialectics, raising questions on every point, stating opposite opinions, tended to unsettle everything in religion; nothing would be left fixed and certain.[4] The more passionate and coarse this attack on all dialectic

[1] An able compend, strictly following, however, the original production, is the work on the Sentences, composed by a certain magister Bandinus, otherwise unknown. (Sententiarum libri quatuor.) This work announces itself as a Compendium circa res divinas; yet professes to be by no means a mere extract from the larger work of another author, although it must have already been perceived to be so by others, as may be gathered from its title as it is cited in one manuscript in Pez: Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, t. i, Dissert. Isagog. f. xlvii, namely: "Abbreviatio de libro sacramentorum magistri Petri Parisiensis episcopi fideliter acta." But as to Peter of Lombardy, we may be certain that he was not the man to need any *such previous labor*.

[2] His *Libri Sententiarum*, in eight parts.

[3] Multi, qui cum sint animales, non percipientes ea, quae sunt spiritus, saeculari-bus literis eruditi, ab illa sapientia, quae terrena est, animalis, diabolica, transeunt ad dijudicanda coelestia. Possunt quidem istiusmodi homines terreni rotare verba spumantia buccis crepantibus de scripturis veritatis, sed ipse spiritus veritatis, qui docet omnem veritatem discipulos Christi, longe abest ab istis discipulis Antichristi. See the Commentary on Ps. 72, in the edition of Pez, f. 1479, often cited in the foregoing volume.

[4] In the prologue, he calls them uno spiritu Aristotelico afflatos. He says of them: Totos dies et noctes tenent, ut interrogent vel respondeant vel dent propositiones vel accipiant, assumant, affirment atque concludant. He says of this method: Sicut enim rerum ita propositionum infinita conversio est, unum idemque verum est et falsum et neutrum, adhibitis mille differentiis facillime negat et probat. Si eis credis, utrum Deus annon Deus, utrum Christus homo annon homo, aliquid annon aliquid, nihil

investigation, the less power it would have in suppressing the dialectical tendency which was so deeply rooted in the spirit of the age. Nor was the mystic Joachim equal to a contest with the dialecticians in the dogmatical province. Pope Innocent the Third, who had himself studied under the Parisian theologians, and in whose canonical decisions the scholastic form there acquired is doubtless to be recognized, pronounced in favor of Peter Lombard at the Lateran council in the year 1215.

But the mystical bent of theology was not less deeply rooted in the very spirit of these centuries than the dialectic; nor had either power enough to overcome the other. And it greatly contributed to promote a healthy action of the spiritual life, that they should mutually act as checks on each other, and mutually supply each other's defects. The dialectic theology, without some such check, would have become, through the excessive predominance of the notional conception, too far estranged from the life of the heart; and the mystic theology, by reason of the great uniformity of feelings, intuitions, and thoughts moving in a narrow circle; the excessive license, the vague, undefined, and fluxional character of its matter,—would have proved injurious to the spiritual life. It was necessary that it should be closely accompanied with a stronger tendency to the objective, a more severe and discriminating mode of thought, a richer fund of ideas.

One of Bernard's contemporaries was the German mystic, abbot Rupert of Deutz, but not to be compared with him for force and depth. He was the author of a diffuse commentary, full of arbitrary, allegorizing expositions on various books of Scripture and passages of sacred history. Another writer deserving to be mentioned here is Richard, who went from Scotland, united with the Victorines in Paris, became a disciple of Hugo, and was prior in that foundation till his death, in the year 1173. Though he had not so much to do with the movements of the dialectic theology as his teacher Hugo, yet, by his uniting a speculative element with the contemplative, we see that he was a true disciple of the latter. He would by no means prohibit reason and the intellect from attempting to explore into divine things. But he considers purification of the heart a necessary prerequisite in order to correctness of understanding. He holds it necessary that the matter known, should be a matter of the heart, something that determines the affections; that reason should be conscious of its own limits, should learn how to distinguish things relatively and absolutely supra-rational from those which it is capable of knowing out of itself; and, with Bernard, he believes in a stage of ecstatic intuition, not mediated by any process of thought, but exalted above thought. The mystic theology led man from the outward world into that inner sanctuary of the spirit which is akin to God; from the depths of self-knowledge conducted him to the heights of the knowledge of God. "The rational mind," says Richard, "finds, without doubt, in itself the most

annon nihil, Christus annon Christus sit nescis. Du Boulay, Hist. univers. Paris, t. ii, f. 402, where he gives extracts from the four books of this work.

excellent mirror wherein to see God. For if God's invisible essence may be known from his works, where can we find those marks that lead to the knowledge of him more clearly stamped than in that which is his own image? Every one, therefore, who longs to see God, should cleanse the mirror of his own spirit.[1] Nothing," says he, "is capable of judging correctly, which does not know itself. He knows not how all the glory of the world lies under his feet, who has not learned to estimate the dignity of his own nature. If thou art not yet capable of entering into thyself, how wilt thou be capable of exploring what is within thee, and above thee."[2] "The truth imparted by the divine grace of knowledge," says he, "must be stamped also by our own efforts, under the coöperation of divine grace, upon our inclinations.[3] What better is the science of holiness without a good disposition, than a picture without life?"[4] In that which constitutes the object of faith, he distinguishes what is above reason, and aside of reason (the *supra rationem* and the *praeter rationem*); but adds, that the latter holds of the relation to human, not of the relation to the divine reason.[5] "As it respects the truths of revelation which are above reason, all evidences and analogies fall short of them, it is true; but to him who has once been conducted by revelation to faith, reasons and analogies flow in abundance from all sides, which serve for the confirmation or defence of his convictions."[6] But those other truths, to which he applies the predicate *praeter rationem*, seem to have all analogies and all rational grounds against them.[7] He distinguishes the three following stages of religious development: that in which God is seen by faith; that in which he is known by reason; that in which he is beheld by contemplation.[8] "To the first and second stages men may ascend; but to the third they can never arrive except by ecstatic transportation of the spirit above itself.[9] The soul, raised above itself, beholds things too high for reason in the light of the Godhead, where the thinking reason retires back."[10] This highest moment of inspiration, he considers, it is true, as a thing not to be attained by any efforts, as something which is solely the gift of God. Yet he says: "None obtain so great grace without strenuous efforts, and ardent

[1] De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. lxxii.

[2] Nihil recte aestimat, qui seipsum ignorat. Nescit quam sub pedibus suis omnis mundana gloria jaceat, qui conditionis suae dignitatem non pensat. Si nondum idoneus es, quomodo ad illa rimanda idoneus eris, quae sunt intra vel supra temetipsum. De contemplatione, c. vi.

[3] Veritatis imago, quae ex inspirante gratia impressa est cognitioni, per humanam industriam et coöperantem gratiam imprimatur et affectioni. De statu interioris hominis, c. xxvi.

[4] Scientia sanctitatis sine intentione bona quid aliud est quam imago sine vita? De eruditione hominis interioris, c. xxxviii.

[5] Quicquid enim in illa summa et divina essentia esse constiterit, summa et incommutabili ratione subsistit. De contemplatione, c. iii.

[6] Fideli menti multae undique rationes occurrunt, multa denique argumenta emergunt.

[7] Tam exempla quam argumenta contradicunt. L. c.

[8] Aliter Deus videtur per fidem, aliter cognoscitur per rationem, atque aliter cernitur per contemplationem.

[9] Nisi per mentis excessum supra seipsos rapti numquam pertingunt.

[10] Mens enim ad illud, quod supra se, elevata et in extasi rapta, de divinitatis lumine conspicit, omnis humana ratio succumbit.

longing."[1] And he supposes such a connection of this loftiest ecstatic moment with the whole of consciousness, that one may afterwards, by thought, reproduce the matter of such intuitions, and bring them down to the common understanding by rational arguments and illustrations (the ἑρμηνεία of the γλῶσσα).[2] But he declaims against certain false philosophers who appeared in these times (among whom he would doubtless include Abelard), men whose sole aim was to invent something new, and get themselves a name; whose wisdom was born and died with themselves. To show the vanity of these endeavors, he points to such examples of conversion among the disciples of this sham wisdom as have been mentioned on a former page.[3] "That once glorious wisdom of the world has so utterly become foolishness, that we see every day countless numbers, who once professed it, begin to deride and abhor it, desiring to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. Behold, how many that formerly labored in the shop of Aristotle, following a sounder conviction, learn finally to labor in the office of our Saviour."[4]

The "Meditations" of Guigo[5] (the fifth prior of the Carthusians, one of Bernard's earlier contemporaries) are especially distinguished for an ethical element of mysticism. "The more noble and mighty any creature is," says he, among other things, "the more willingly does he subject himself to the truth; nay, his nobleness and his might depend on this very self-subjection to the truth. The way to God is easy, for a man walks in it by unburdening himself. It would be hard, were it necessary for him to take up a load. Throw off, then, every burden, by denying all else, and thyself."[6]

It is not to be doubted that in the great metropolis of scientific and theological education at Paris, the powerful influence of the Victorine school on the interior life was greatly needed, to counteract the ungodly courses pursued by the theologians who fell in with the tendency to a dead, formal knowledge; for we hear those who were most zealously devoted to the interests of the church, complaining that the lives of both teachers and pupils were in direct contradiction to a study professing to relate wholly to divine things. Jacob of Vitry, who had himself studied at Paris, depicts in the most vivid colors the loose morals of the students, by whom the more seriously disposed were hooted at with contempt; the worldly tastes, jealousies, envyings, and cupidity of the teachers, whose knowledge he likens to sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.[7]

[1] De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. lxxiii et lxxiv.

[2] Id quod per excessum mens vidit multa retractatione vehementique discussione capabile seu etiam comprehensibile sibi efficit et tum rationum attestatione, tum similitudinum adaptatione ad communem intelligentiam deducit,— or in other words: Theophaniam raptim perceptam ad communem intelligentiam paululum inclinamus. De contemplatione, c. xii.

[3] Page 358.

[4] L. c. c. ii.

[5] In the Biblioth. patr. Lugd. t. xxii.

[6] Facile est iter ad Deum, quoniam exonerando itur. Esset autem grave, si onerando iretur. In tantum ergo te exonera, ut dimissis omnibus, te ipsum abneges.

[7] Jacob of Vitry in his Historia occidentalis, c. vii, p. 277, seqq.: Tunc autem amplius in clero quam in alio populo dissoluta pernitiosa exempla multos hospites undique ad eam affluentes corrumpebant. — In

In the last times of the twelfth century, Peter Cantor, a man with the spirit of a reformer, and a practical, scriptural turn of mind, held a prominent place among the Victorines. He had his surname from the office which he filled in that foundation. Afterwards, from the year 1194, he was bishop of Tournay. He fought with great earnestness against secularization in the church; he saw the impossibility of effecting a renovation of church life without an improvement in theological studies. For the instruction and admonition of the young men that consecrated themselves to the service of the church, he composed his *Summa*,[1] a work treating for the most part of moral and ecclesiastical matters. The same Jacob of Vitry, who so vividly described the corruption of the Parisian theologians, signalizes him as a light that shone far and wide; a man, who accomplished so much the greater things, as his life and his teaching were both of a piece.[2] He declared himself opposed to that mode of treating theology which chiefly busied itself with vain and fruitless questions, to the neglect of those matters which tended to the sanctification and benefit of the church.[3] He spoke against those who labored by their arbitrary interpretations to bring the unchangeable, eternally valid commands of our Lord into harmony with their fleshly lusts; explaining away whatever was too high for them, as barely temporal and local, as a *consilium* and not a *praeceptum*.[4] "How is it," he asks, "that we who hold every-

una et eadem domo scholae erant superius, prostibula inferius. — Si qui secundum apostolicum mandatum sobrie et juste et pie inter illos vivere voluissent, avari et miseri et hypocritae, superstitiosi confestim ab impudicis et mollibus judicabantur. Respecting the teachers of theology, he says: Docentes et non facientes facti sunt velut aes sonans et cymbalum tinniens. Non solum autem sibi invidebant, et scholares aliorum blanditiis attrahebant gloriam propriam quaerentes, de fructu autem animarum non curantes, praebendas sibi multiplicabant et vendebantur dignitates. We may here add the description of William of Paris: "Adeo tepide, adeo remisse verba Dei annunciant, ut extincta in labiis eorum penitus videantur, propter quod, sicut et ipsi frigidi sunt et extincti, sic frigidos et extinctos relinquunt et utinam non faciant adhuc pejores." He adduces the example of a friend of his, who, to avoid becoming colder and colder under the sermons and lectures at Paris, and having every spark of his spiritual life finally extinguished (ne tandem spirituali gelicidio extingueretur), had fled from the spot and betaken himself to monks of fervent piety. Vide De moribus, c. viii, t. i, f. 120. He laments over the Parisian teachers, who exerted themselves only to increase the number of their hearers, and not to promote their spiritual improvement: "Non de profectu eorum spirituali curant, sed de repletione scholarum suarum nec minus turpiter quam inverecunde sonat creberrime in labiis hujusmodi magistrorum: hic est clericus meus, hic incepit sub me." He then remarks that many such had by their own fault lost their hearers, so as finally to be obliged to discontinue their lectures, "Quia promissionibus et muneribus instar meretricum eos (auditores) vel emunt vel conducunt, interdum etiam precibus, et terroribus extorquent ab iis, ut ita dicam, violentia audientiem." L. c. c. cexix.

[1] His Summa theologiae, or Verbum abbreviatum, published by the Benedictine Gallopin, at Bergen, A. D. 1639.

[2] Morum honestate pondus et gravitatem conferens doctrinae suae, coepit enim facere et docere, velut lucerna ardens et lucens, et civitas supra montem posita. Hist. occident. c. viii. He finally resigned his bishopric, became a monk among the Cistercians, and died before he had closed his novitiate. Caesarius of Heisterbach, who reports this, says of him: Vita et exemplo multos aedificaverat. Distinct. xii, c. xlviii, f. 353.

[3] In the above-mentioned Verbum abbreviatum, p. 7: Non ergo clamandum in disputationibus theologiae, non disputandum de frivolis sed, ut ait Seneca, de justitia, de pietate, de frugalitate, de utraque pudicitia mentis scilicet et corporis mihi disputa. Deponamus igitur hujus declamationis acutae concinnationes, quaestiunculas inutiles.

[4] Qui mandata ipsa confirmata in saeculum saeculi dicit esse temporalia, localia, personalia et praecepta consilia, addens et

thing in Christ's teaching to be easy and clear, have, by our explanations and allegories, departed farther from the life-giving spirit and the plain letter of the gospel, than the Jews did from that letter which killeth?"[1] The unpractical direction given to theological culture was attacked also by archdeacon Peter of Blois: "What does it profit them," says he,[2] speaking of the theologians, "to spend their days in studies that can find their application neither at home nor in war, nor in the court nor in the cloister, nor in the senate nor in the church, nor anywhere else, save only in the schools?" He declaims, like Hugo a St. Victore, and John of Salisbury, whose scholar he was, against the men who dived into purely speculative matters before they had learned anything else;[3] against those who, in their eagerness after the latest novelty, left all that was old in utter neglect. "Of what use is it," says he, "to heap up copies of lectures, to commit to memory the *Summas*, to condemn the writings of the ancients, and to reject everything that is not to be found in the teacher's notes?"[4] He declaimed against that bold speculation on divine things which would own no limits, and against the unfruitful disputes of the schools.[5] The essence of faith consisted, in his opinion, in its power of grasping that which is not attainable by reason. Where reason discovers its impotence, there the might of faith, he thought, was most conspicuously manifested. It was the interest of reason to repose on faith; for the merit of faith redounded not to its own benefit, but directly to that of reason. For faith must one day cease, and make way for perfect knowledge. But reason would remain forever constantly passing on from one stage of development to another, and would one day discover how she owed it to faith, kept in this present life, that after faith had ceased she had risen to perfect knowledge.[6] Peter of Blois found reason to complain also of theologians, who, having spent almost their whole lives in the study of the ancients, of philosophy, or of the civil law, had become so wholly estranged from the study of the Bible as to have lost all sense[7] for depth in simplicity, so that the language of the Bible seemed to them childish and spiritless.

subtrahens, interpretans et exponens ad voluntatem et libitum suum. Qui ob hoc solum, quod mandata Dei nolunt implere opere, laborant nimis in expositione eorum.

[1] L. c. p. 211.

[2] Ep. 101.

[3] Quidam antequam disciplinis elementaribus imbuantur, docentur inquirere de puncto, de linea, de superficie, de quantitate animae, de fato, de pronitate naturae, de casu et libero arbitrio, de materia et motu, quid sit tempus, quid locus, de essentia universalium et aliis quampluribus, quae plenioris scientiae fundamentum et eminentiores exigunt intellectus.

[4] Quae utilitas est, schedulas evolvere, firmare verbotenus summas, et sophismatum versutias inversare, damnare scripta veterum et reprobare omnia, quae non inveniuntur in suorum schedulis magistrorum?

[5] Hodie (says he. ep. 140) varia est inter multos sententiarum contentio, factaeque sunt aquae Siloës, quae cum silentio currebant, aquae contradictionis, apud quas demeruerunt Moses et Aron terrae promissionis introitum.

[6] Attingit fides, quod non praesumit ratio, et, quod mirabilius est, ex rationis defectu fortius convalescit. Apprehendit fides per gratiam, quod non potuit ratio capere per scipsam, ratio succumbit, ut fides amplius mereatur, nec invidet ratio merito fidei, sed libenter et humiliter acquiescit. Quod enim fides meretur, non sibi ipsi meretur, sed potius rationi. Sane fides evacuabitur et ratio permanebit.

[7] Peter of Blois writes to such an one, ep. 76: In fabulis paganorum, in philosophorum studiis, tandem in jure civili dies tuos usque in senium expendisti et contra omnium diligentium te voluntatem sacram

Bishop Stephen of Tournay (earlier, president of the abbey of St. Genovese at Paris) wrote to one of the immediate successors of pope Alexander the Third a remarkable letter,[1] in which he bitterly complained of the thirst for novelty among the theologians, of the profane liberties taken in treating the mysteries of faith, of the contradictory opinions held by theological teachers; and called upon the pope to introduce greater uniformity of doctrine into the universities. "The study of sacred science with us," he writes, "has fallen into confusion, the students approving of naught but what is new, and the teachers thinking more of their reputation than of the interests of truth, continually giving out new summaries and commentaries on theology, for the purpose of attracting and deceiving their hearers;[2] as if the works of the holy fathers, that have explained the sacred Scriptures in the same spirit with which the apostles and prophets wrote them, did not suffice. Against the ecclesiastical laws disputes are publicly held on God's incomprehensible essence. Loquacious flesh and blood contend irreverently about the incarnation of the Word; the indivisible Trinity is divided and rent to pieces in the streets; so that already there are as many errors as there are teachers, as many scandals as lecture-halls, as many blasphemies as streets."[3] He complains, in violent language, of the licentiousness that had found its way among the faculty of liberal arts; that beardless youth set themselves up for teachers, and, with contempt of all ancient rules, and of all the books standing in cherished authority, catch those that hear them in the webs of their sophistry.[4] Accordingly, he entreats the pope to thrust in here the hand of reform, so that by his authority uniformity of doctrine and discipline might be restored, and that divine teachings might not be rendered contemptible by becoming vulgar, so that it might not be said in corners: Here is Christ, or there is Christ; so that the holy might not be given unto the dogs, the pearls cast before swine, for them to trample under their feet. The popes, however, were not inclined to be hurried at once, by such remonstrances of individuals, into any arbitrary interference. The spirit of the church, of which they were the organs, demanded a certain manifoldness of development.

The dialectic theology, after having triumphantly passed through

theologiae paginam damnabiliter horruisti. The same writer had called the sermo evangelicus durus, insipidus, infantilis.

[1] Ep. 241, p. 366, in the edition of Claude Du Molinet. Paris, 1682. One of the letters which are not yet to be found in the earlier imperfect edition of Massen and in the Bibl. patr. Lugd.

[2] Lapsa sunt apud nos in confusione officinarum sacrarum studia literarum, dum et discipuli solis novitatibus applaudunt et magistri gloriae potius invigilant, quam doctrinae, novas recentesque summulas et commentaria firmantia super theologica passim conscribunt, quibus auditores suos demulceant, detineant, decipiant.

[3] Disputatur publice contra sacras constitutiones de incomprehensibili Deitate, de incarnatione verbi verbosa caro et sanguis irreverenter litigat. Individua trinitas in triviis secatur et discerpitur, ut tot jam sint errores, quot doctores, tot scandala, quot auditoria, tot blasphemiae, quot plateae.

[4] Quod facultates, quas liberales appellant, amissa libertate pristina in tantam servitutem dejiciantur, ut comatuli adolescentes earum magisteria impudenter usurpent et in cathedra seniorum sedeant imberbes et qui nondum norunt esse discipuli, laborant, ut nominentur magistri. Omissis regulis artium abjectisque libris authenticis, artificio muscas tanquam ingnavium verborum et sophismatibus suis tanquam aranearum tendiculis includunt.

the conflicts of the twelfth century, was handed over to the thirteenth, by Alanus (Alain), dignified by his age, on account of the variety of his attainments, and the diligence of his pen, with the name of universal teacher, Alanus the Great (Alanus Magnus), and surnamed Insulensis, after the place of his birth, Lille ab Insula. Here he was born, before 1128; he taught at Paris, became a Cistercian monk, and died in the year 1202.[1] What chiefly characterizes this schoolman is, his departure from the method of the Sententiaries, by entering into a purely rational exposition of his subject-matter. In an *Ars Catholicae fidei*, dedicated to pope Clement the Third, he undertook to expound, in five books, all the doctrines of faith in a connected chain of brief propositions, one of which should be clearly deducible from the other. It was designed to furnish arguments for the faith, which an acute mind could hardly resist, so that he who would not believe the prophets and the gospel, should at least be convinced by demonstration of human reason. But he added, that these arguments would by no means suffice to produce faith; for a faith that proceeded from nothing but reason would be without merit (*meritum*). "It will be our privilege and glory in heaven," says he, "to comprehend with perfect knowledge, what we now see only in a glass darkly."[2] After the same method, he compiled also a series of brief propositions, as *Regulae theologicae*, which he accompanied with illustrations.[3]

In the twelfth century, traces of the influence of the Aristotelian dialectics may already be discerned; though, at first, only single logical writings of that great philosopher could have been known. But far more important became this influence, and far greater the new spring which was thereby given to dialectics and speculation in the following century, when men became better acquainted with Aristotle, partly from translations made at second-hand from the Arabic, partly from such as were made directly from the original Greek,[4] and his metaphysical and ethical works came to be studied with great diligence. But this new direction, again, had to encounter much violent opposition. A speculative system, which, near the beginning of the thirteenth century,[5] had become widely popular at Paris, and which was really calculated to undermine all the religious faith of the times, could not fail to appear as a dangerous symptom to those who had to watch over the doctrines of the church; and the real source of such doctrines being unknown, and wrongly attributed by some to the Aristotelian philosophy, it was natural that the latter should be looked upon with suspicion. Pope Gregory the Ninth issued, in 1228, a letter to the university of Paris, warning its teachers[6] against the presumptu-

[1] Most celebrated in his own age for his poem, called Anticlaudianus; also, author of a Summa de arte praedicandi.

[2] The cited work published in Pez, Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, t. i. f. 476.

[3] Published by Mingarelli, in the Anecdotorum fasciculus. Romae, 1756.

[4] See on this point, Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote, par M. Jourdain. Paris, 1819.

[5] The doctrines of Almaric of Bena, of which we shall speak in another connection.

[6] Of whom he says: Praesumptores hujusmodi doctrinam naturalem amplexantes verborum folia et non fructus auditoribus suis apponunt.

ous and false use of philosophy in matters of faith. He complained, probably not without reason, of the forced interpretations whereby it was attempted to bring the declarations of Holy Scripture into harmony with the doctrines of such philosophers as had never known the true God.[1] He told these teachers that, by undertaking to prove everything on philosophical grounds, they made faith superfluous.[2] In what light the arrogance of the new dialectic tendency appeared to the religious spirit of the times, is illustrated by the fable into which the history of one of the first zealous supporters of the Aristotelian philosophy, and of its application to theology, Simon of Tournay,[3] was converted. This individual, having passed from the study of philosophy to that of theology, and for several years given lectures on the latter subject, had, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, acquired such extraordinary celebrity, that none but the most capacious edifices could hold the crowds of his hearers. In a certain lecture, having started a variety of doubts on the doctrine of the Trinity, he deferred the resolution of them to the next day. The whole tribe of theological students flocked with eager expectation the next day, to his lecture room, when he explained all the difficulties in so satisfactory a manner that the whole assembly were struck with one sentiment of admiration. Several of them, who were intimate with him, now went up and earnestly besought him, that he would dictate the lecture over again for them to copy, that all this knowledge might not be lost. Scouting such a consequence, with a burst of laughter, he exclaimed: "O my little Jesus, little Jesus, how much have I helped to establish and glorify thy doctrine! Verily, had I a mind to stand forth as its opponent, I might bring still stronger arguments against it." But no sooner was this uttered than he found himself unable to speak another word; he had lost both voice and memory. He had to spend two years in learning over again the alphabet; and only with the greatest difficulty succeeded in recommitting to memory so as feebly to stammer out the Lord's prayer and the creed.[4]

[1] Ad sensum doctrinae philosophorum ignorantium Deum sacra eloquia extortis expositionibus, imo distortis inflectunt.

[2] Dum fidem conantur plus debito ratione adstruere naturali, nonne illam reddunt quodammodo inutilem et inanem?

[3] A writer belonging to the second half of the thirteenth century, Henry of Ghent, archdeacon of Tournay, who, in his work on the ecclesiastical authors of his own time, c. 24 (published by Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca ecclesiastica), gives the simplest account of him, refers to his writings, a liber sententiarum suarum, moreover, the exposition of the quaestiones, quas in scholis suis disputatas terminavit, an explication of the Athanasian creed, — and could say nothing worse of him than this: Dum nimis et in hoc et in aliis scriptis suis Aristotelem sequitur, a nonnullis modernis haereseos arguitur. This latter fact, together perhaps with the many peculiarities of the man, and the accident he met with during his celebrated academical labors, and which put an end to them, may have given occasion to the whole of this singular legend. If some of his writings were published, we might be able to form a correct judgment of the whole matter. The copy of the very lecture with which this whole story was connected seems to be still extant, according to the report of the History of French literature composed by the Benedictines of S. Maur.

[4] So states Matthew of Paris, at the year 1202 (ed. Lond. 1686, f. 173) and he adds: Hoc igitur miraculum multorum scholarium suppressit arrogantiam et jactantiam refracnavit. He appeals to the oral account of an eye-witness, who had studied in Paris, and afterwards became bishop of Durham. That which contradicts and that which agrees with this account, in Thomas Cantiprat's report of the same incident

Yet the philosophy of Aristotle, after the way had been so well prepared for its influence by the progress of events in the twelfth century, laid too strong a hold on the scientific minds to be rent away so easily. And when only the outward results were looked at, when it was observed that men of universally acknowledged piety, eminent for their zeal in behalf of the interests of faith and of the church, drew from this philosophy their weapons for the defence of the truths of faith, it could not be believed that from such a quarter any danger was to be feared. So this philosophy came at length to be patronized and protected even by the popes.

What gave Aristotle this great power of attracting the minds of men, was the combination, so peculiar to him, of dialectical acuteness with sound experimental observation, the comprehensive range of his inquiries, the fruitfulness of his logical formulas, which the great teachers of this century knew how to turn to such good purpose.

In earlier centuries, we noticed, indeed, a great difference between the influences of the Platonic and of the Aristotelian philosophy. We observed that, by the latter, was called forth a one-sided direction of the understanding, which stood chiefly in a negative relation to the dogmas of the church; while the Platonic philosophy, which had more to stir the feelings, and to excite religious intuition, might be reconciled with the church doctrines and used for their support. But the positive element of the Christian and churchly spirit in the thirteenth century was too powerful, the mystical element was too much fused and blended with the dialectic, in all the great minds of the age, to render it possible, on the whole, for a negative tendency, in reference to the church, to be called forth by the Aristotelian philosophy. And

while it testifies against the literal truth of the story, yet supports the fact lying at the foundation of it. He transfers to him that assertion respecting the three deceivers of the world, which was ascribed by others to the emperor Frederic the Second. He says that this Simon, at the close of one of his lectures, uttered a blasphemy of this sort, and, as soon as he had expressed it, was attacked by a fit of epilepsy, and three days afterwards fell into the condition described by Matthew of Paris, in which condition he remained till he died. He mentions also, as a characteristic trait, that Simon, whom he represents as a man of unchaste manners. — Matthew of Paris states also that he had two sons, — could at last only pronounce the name of his concubine, but not the title of the work of Boethius on the Trinity, which he before knew almost entirely by heart; see Apes, lib. ii, c. xlviii. But really, if this Simon — as would seem probable from the chronology, — was the same person with the one whom Stephen of Tournay recommended to the archbishop of Rheims, he is represented on this occasion in a very favorable light. This Stephen recommended him in connection with a controversy which he had with his bishop and the other canonicals, — and which, too, may have contributed to bring him into bad repute, — to the archbishop of Rheims: Inde est quod magistro Simoni viro *inter scholares cathedras* egregio non necesse est verbosas emendicare preces aut laudum venalium coram vobis praeconia erogare. Gratiosum et commendabilem faciunt eum *hinc auctoritas morum*, hinc peritia literarum. Ep. 79. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 17. But the testimony of this person is here certainly of peculiar weight, since he was one of the zealous advocates for the church party, and of the opponents to licentiousness of doctrine, — being inclined, indeed, to confine speculation within too narrow limits, as is plain from the letter quoted on a former page, 416. The author of the article on Simon of Tournay, in the Hist. lit. de la France, t. xvi, who gives a list of his works preserved in the Parisian libraries, found nothing in them which could serve either to establish or to explain the charges that had been brought against him. See l. c. p. 394.

along with the Aristotelian element was combined also, in the case of these teachers, a not less powerfully working Platonic one, which had been conveyed into them by Augustin, by the Pseudo-Dionysian writings, and by Arabic and Latin translations of the Platonists; as, in fact, the Aristotelian philosophy, even among the Arabians, whose philosophical culture spread to the Christian nations, was penetrated with elements of New Platonism.[1] By distinguishing the different positions of nature and of grace, of the natural and of the supernatural, they might undertake to bring the doctrines of Aristotle into harmony with those of revelation; and we shall see how this distinction was connected with their whole mode of contemplation.

The characteristic feature in the method of these men consisted in this: to start a multitude of isolated questions on all the subjects of which they treated, to state the arguments on both sides, and then sum up with a brief decision (*conclusio* or *resolutio*), in which regard was had to the arguments on both sides. This method served greatly to promote the habit of contemplating a subject on its several sides, as well as to exercise acuteness. Much that was brought forward in later times, on deistical grounds, against the doctrines of revelation, is to be found already in the writings of these schoolmen, among the negative grounds, to which they had regard; and it is evident how carefully they had examined every objection that could be raised against their own theological position. But this method of questioning and defining, was unfavorable to a coherent organic comprehension and development. It afforded abundant nourishment for a species of sophistry, though it might be unconscious sophistry, which was skilful in finding many reasons for that which was untrue or but half true. Add to this, that the above-mentioned theologians, while they kept themselves within those limits of inquiry prescribed by the doctrines of the church, must undertake to prove everything they found contained there, though this was by no means a purposed accommodation; but the fact was, that the view of Christianity presented by the church tradition, had, after an unconscious and involuntary manner, blended itself with their whole life and mode of thinking. There were two authorities by which the minds of men were governed: in the province of natural reason, the authority of Aristotle, called preëminently the philosopher; in the Christian province, the authority of the church tradition. From the contrariety between these two authorities, and the results to which theologians, whose thinking was directed by the spirit of Christianity, so far as it could move with freedom at all, were led, there arose among them inconsistencies and contradictions, which, by some artifice or other, they must needs reconcile or cover over.

The most important representatives and schools of the scholastic theology, proceeded from the two orders of the mendicant friars: from the order of the Franciscans, the Englishman Alexander of Hales, and the Italian Bonaventura. The history of the Franciscan order led us often

[1] See the very interesting and instructive tract, Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes, par A. Schmölders. Paris, 1842. p. 95, etc.

to speak of the last-named individual, who entered the order in 1238, at the age of sixteen, took up its defence with enthusiasm, and finally was placed at its head as general. Bonaventura's original name, like that of his father, was John of Fidanza. He was born at Bagnarea, not far from Viterbo in Italy, about the year 1221, and lived to assist at the general council of Lyons in 1274, during the session of which he died. In him, we find once more united the mystical and the dialectic theology. He distinguished himself as a writer of mystical and practical works on Christianity, and of a commentary on the *Sentences*. In the order of the Dominicans appeared Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas. Albert the Great was descended from an ancient princely family, and was born at Lauingen, nor far from Dillingen, in the year 1193, entered the Dominican order in 1223, and studied at Paris, Padua, and Bologna; he taught in Hildesheim, Freiburg, Regensburg, Strasburg, Paris, and Cologne. The last-mentioned city was more particularly the seat of his activity as a teacher. In 1260, he was compelled, by pope Alexander the Fourth, to accept the bishopric of Regensburg. But after he had sustained the duties of this office two years, anxious to be released from the perplexing crowd of foreign affairs which devolved on German bishops, and to return to his former quiet life, consecrated to religion and science, he obtained a dismission from pope Urban the Fourth, and then devoted himself wholly, till the close of his life at Cologne, to his labors as a writer and teacher, though he was often called upon to transact business connected with the episcopal office within the diocese of Cologne. He is said to have been present at the general council of Lyons in 1274; and he died on the 15th of November in the year 1280.[1] His great mind grasped the whole compass of human knowledge, as it existed in his time. He abounded in profound, suggestive ideas, with which he fructified the minds of his contemporaries, and in far-reaching anticipations of truth. On the theological development of this century and the succeeding ones, a still more powerful influence was exerted by his great disciple, Thomas Aquinas.

He was born in the year 1225 or 1227,[2] at the castle of Rocca Sicca, belonging to his family, not far from the city of Aquino, on the dividing line between the States of the Church and the Neapolitan territory. He was descended from a very noble family. At the age of five, he was placed in the abbey of Monte Cassino to be educated, where he received the first rudiments of learning. Afterwards he repaired, for the prosecution of his studies, to the university at Naples. At this time, the preachers of the mendicant orders were exercising a great power over the minds of the youth, and successfully endeavoring to win over the distinguished young men to their order; and it so happened that Thomas also was attracted by the charm of this novel appearance; and, without the knowledge of his friends, entered, in

[1] See Echard, t. i, f. 162.

[2] The year of his birth is disputed, because it cannot be exactly determined whether he was forty-eight or fifty years old at the time of his death.

1243, when a young man, the Dominican order. His pious mother, Theodora, was at first not displeased with this resolution of her son; she only wished to see him. But the monks, who were little accustomed to pay respect to the ties and feelings of nature, felt themselves bound to prevent such an interview, fearing lest the promising young man might be taken away from them by force. But their pains to keep the son from the sight of his mother, had an effect directly contrary to that which they intended. The enraged mother complained to her sons, who were serving in the army of the emperor Frederic the Second, and adjured them, as they valued her motherly blessing, to obtain her child for her once more. They went and actually succeeded in getting the young Thomas from the order, and making themselves master of his person. But no force could compel him to lay aside the dress of his order. Two years' imprisonment in a castle could not break his will. He spent these days of solitude in studying through the Bible and the works of Peter Lombard. His mother, being at length convinced that it was impossible to conquer his will, assisted, herself, in letting him down with a cord from a window, so that he could escape. Here several companions of his order stood waiting to receive him, and he was welcomed back, with great joy, by the Dominicans in Naples. Soon after this he was sent to Cologne, to pursue his studies under the guidance of the great German teacher, Albert. His taciturn disposition procured for him here the surname *bos mutus*, and nobody dreamed of what was within him. On a certain occasion, however, when he distinguished himself beyond the expectations of all, in an academical disputation, Albert the Great exclaimed: "We call him the *mute ox*, but he will turn out a teacher whose voice will be heard through the whole world." At some later period he was sent to Paris, where he obtained his academical degree. In the year 1253, he was made doctor of theology; and in the twenty years till his death, he composed his great and numerous works, on subjects philosophical and theological, among which latter may be mentioned his *Summa theologiae*, his Commentary on the Sentences, his Apologetical work against the heathens, and several of his *opuscula*. This department of his labors deserves the more to be admired, because it was not the only one. He was an active teacher of youth; and his lectures were so attractive that it was hardly possible to find a hall large enough to hold the multitude of his auditors. He preached, also; and he taught, not only in Paris, but sometimes also at the university of Naples; and was therefore occasionally interrupted in his other labors by his journeys to and from Italy.[1] He is said to have employed three or four amanuenses, to all whom he dictated at once on different subjects. His writings show that his thoughts on divine things flowed from a full heart; he was conscious of the necessary connection subsisting between thought and feeling. Every day he was accustomed to have something

[1] The author of the Life of Thomas Aquinas (William of Thoco), says, at the 7th of March, c. iv: Unum videtur Deus in dicto doctore, dum viveret, manifestum ostendisse miraculum, ut tam modico tempore, forte in viginti annis, qui inter magisterium ejus et obitum in vita fluxerunt, bis eundo Parisios et in Italiam redeundo, tot potuerit libros per suos scriptores in scriptis redigere

read to him from a work of edification (Rufin's *Collationes patrum*); and when he was asked why he took this time from his speculative studies, he replied that he thought the excitement of devotion prepared him for soaring upwards to speculation. When the feelings are enkindled by devotion, the thoughts would more easily ascend to the highest matters.[1] He never began to study, to dispute, to give lectures, to write, or to dictate, without first betaking himself to prayer for divine illumination. Whenever doubts confronted him in his investigations, he left off meditating, in order to seek divine guidance in prayer.[2] In secular affairs, too, his clear, discriminating understanding is said to have shown aptitude and ability; and hence Louis the Ninth of France was in the habit of consulting him even on the affairs of government. Once, when busily engaged on his *Summa theologiae*, he was obliged, against his will, to appear at the table of this monarch. But he took his seat there fully absorbed in his own thoughts. Suddenly striking his fist on the table, he exclaimed: "There! the Manicheans are down." Wrapped up in his speculations, he thought he had just discovered a conclusive argument against Manicheanism, and had lost all recollection of the place where he was. His prior, sitting next to him, seized his arm, and reminded him that he was at the king's table. Then Thomas came to his senses, and excused himself to the monarch. But the pious king enjoyed it, and was much edified to find that the honor of such an invitation and of such company could not divert one whose thoughts were wholly absorbed in higher things, from his meditations on divine matters. He considered it important, that not one of these thoughts should be lost, and sent immediately for a scribe, to whom Thomas was obliged to dictate the whole. This great theologian died on his journey to the general council of Lyons, whither he was summoned by the pope, in 1274.

Besides these theologians of the mendicant orders, we should mention one distinguished man, who was preëminent alike in practical and theoretical matters, — in the practical government of the church, as a bishop, preacher, and pastor; and in science, as an apologist, dogmatician, and moral theologian. This was William of Auvergne[3] (born at Aurillac), who was chosen bishop of Paris in 1228, and died in the year 1248.[4]

One of the extraordinary men of the thirteenth century, who stood

[1] William of Thoco cites as a reason (iii, 22): Quia frequenter contingit, quod dum intellectus superius subtilia speculatur, affectus inferius a devotione remittitur.

[2] William of Thoco finely remarks on this subject: Unde videbatur in ejus anima intellectus et affectus sicut invicem se comprehendunt, ut affectus orando mereretur ad divina ingredi, et intellectus hujus merito intueri, quae altius intelligeret, quo affectio ardentius in id, quod luce caperet, amore flagraret.

[3] Hence known also under the name of Guilelmus Alvernus.

[4] His apologetical work, *De fide et legibus*, also aimed against Mohammedanism; his ethical writings, *De virtutibus, moribus, vitiis et peccatis, de tentationibus et resistentiis*, — his writings on particular points of doctrine, his more comprehensive work. *De universo*, his tract, *De rhetorica divina* (on the art of correct prayer). His works were published, in two folio volumes, at Paris, in 1674. His particular doctrinal and ethical writings are so wrought out as to form, together, one whole.

forth to resist the ruling authorities of their times, was the Englishman Roger Bacon, a man of a free spirit beyond all others, full of great ideas of reform; ideas that contained the germs of new creations, reaching farther in their consequences and results than he himself, firmly rooted—as, with all his aspirations, he still was—in the times in which he lived, either understood or intended. He was born near Ilchester in Somersetshire, in 1214. He was educated under the influence of that free-hearted man, so full of the spirit of reform, Robert Grosshead (Grouthead), mentioned already on a former page;[1] who, as bishop of Lincoln, and under the name of *Robertus Lincolniensis*, held an important rank among the scholastic theologians of this period;[2] and whom Bacon himself was accustomed to name with peculiar reverence, as one of the great scholars of that age.[3] He entered, by the advice of his patron,—who at first expected much good from the orders of mendicant friars,—into the Franciscan order; but the free direction which his mind took exposed him to many persecutions in the same. For many years he languished in the confinement of a cell, until, by the interposition of powerful patrons, he obtained his freedom. He died at Oxford in the year 1294.

In the work containing his ideas on the reform of science, the *Opus majus*,[4] which he composed by invitation of pope Clement the Fourth, to whom he dedicated it,[5] he denounced dependence on authority and custom as a source of the great majority of errors, and advocated free inquiry after truth. He said that the church fathers themselves laid no claim to infallibility. They had corrected themselves, had disputed with one another; as, for example, Augustin with Jerome. Men should not feel bound by their authority, therefore, where they have erred; but imitate them in seeking a continually progressive improvement. "Had they lived to our times, they would have altered for the better many more things than they had done."[6] He cites the dispute between Paul and Peter at Antioch, to show that holy men had mutually corrected each other, and firmly withstood each other.[7] He adopted the idea of the church theocracy from the prevailing view of his times, altering it only in the essential point, that he was for having the sacred Scriptures the guiding and determining principle for every-

[1] Page 185.

[2] It is to be lamented that we know so little of him in this respect, as nothing has been published from his greater works.

[3] Solum dominus Robertus, dictus Grossum Caput, novit scientias. Opus majus, f. 45.

[4] Ed. Jebb. Londini, 1733.

[5] Which, however, is perhaps not yet completely published.

[6] P. 10–17: Ne igitur nos simus causa erroris nostri et fiat magnum sapientiae impedimentum ex eo, quod vias sanctorum et sapientum non intelligimus, ut expedit, possumus auctoritate sanctorum et sapientum antiquorum considerare pia mente et animo reverenti propter veritatis dignitatem, quae omnibus antefertur, si sancti et sapientes aliqua, quae humanam imperfectionem important, protulerunt, in quibus seu affirmatis seu negatis non oportet quod nos imitemus ex fronte. Scimus quidem, quod non solum dederunt nobis consilium et licentiam hoc faciendi, sed conspicimur, quod ipsi multa posuerunt magna auctoritate, quae postea majori humilitate retractaverunt et ideo latuit in iis magna imperfectio prioribus temporibus. Quod si vixissent usque nunc, multa plura correxissent et mutassent.

[7] Sancti etiam ipsi mutuo suas correxerunt positiones et sibi invicem fortiter resistebant.

thing, whether relating to knowledge or to life. All the wisdom requisite for the determination of all the relations of life, and all science were, in their principle and source, to be found in the Holy Scriptures.[1] There was but one perfect wisdom given by the one only God for the entire human family, which was wholly contained in the sacred Scriptures; but it was to be deduced and evolved from them by philosophy and the canonical law.[2] A reformation according to this method, in all studies, should be introduced. The entire church would then be governed again as it was in the times of the saints; in all the affairs of the church, among princes and laymen, a universal peace would then prevail. As the church among the Jews was governed by the law of God, so must it be again among the Christians.[3] In principle, at least, everything must be governed by that law. All evils, through the various ranks of society, he traced to ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, the source of faith and the rule of life. So zealous was he in favor of the general study of the Scriptures, that he would have all the laity read, and so be able to make use of them. Nor should they rest satisfied with the Vulgate, which he saw needed correction; but they should study the Old and New Testaments in the original texts. By means of a universal grammar, discovered by himself, he engaged to give any man, in three days, such knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues as would enable him to understand the Scriptures in each of these languages.

Considering it, as he did, a matter of so much importance that everything should be referred to the study of the Bible, he could not but lament that this was so much neglected by the theologians, and, compared with the study of the new dialectic theology, thrown wholly into the background; that any man who, at Paris or Bologna, would give lectures on the Bible, must, in respect to time and place, give way to him who would read on the Sentences.[4] Theology, he said, in these schools, took just the opposite course of the other faculties; for, in the other faculties, the text always went for more than the commentary; and he who rightly understood the text was considered as having a correct understanding of the whole; and yet the text, in theology, was one infinitely higher than that in any of the other facul-

[1] Tota sapientia est ibi principaliter contenta et fontaliter, in his tract, (not yet published alas!) addressed to pope Clement the Fourth: De laude scripturae sacrae, from which weighty extracts have been communicated in Usserii historia dogmatica de scripturis, ed. Wharton. Londini, 1690, p. 421.

[2] Ut sicut in pugno colligitur, quod latius in palma explicatur, sic tota sapientia utilis homini continetur in sacris literis, licet non tota explicetur, sed ejus explicatio est jus canonicum et philosophia, nam utrumque jacet in visceribus sacrae scripturae et de his exivit et super hoc fundantur omnia, quae utiliter dicunter in jure canonico et philosophia. L. c.

[3] Quod regimen ecclesiae, sicut per legem Dei regebatur antiquitus apud Hebraeos, sic esse nunc apud Christianos.

[4] Boulaeus quotes the remarkable words from a chapter not yet published of the Opus majus: De theologorum peccatis, Hist. univers. Paris, t. iii, f. 383. Baccalaureus, qui legit textum, succumbit lectori sententiarum. Parisiis ille, qui legit sententias, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet socium et cameram apud religiosos, sed qui legit bibliam, caret his et mendicat horam legendi secundum quod placet lectori sententiarum.

ties. It was a text brought into the world through the mouth of our Lord and of the saints, and so great, that an entire life would scarce suffice to explain it wholly.[1]

We may remark, also, by the way, that Roger Bacon coincides with another original man of this age, Raymund Lull, in pointing out the necessity of a complete scientific education for missionaries, and particularly in insisting that missions, undertaken without any correct ideas of geography and ethnography, must necessarily prove failures; all which he explained at large.[2]

As Roger Bacon suggested the necessity of an emendation of the extremely corrupted Vulgate, of which the manuscripts varied from each other to an astonishing extent,[3] so the need of this came now to be felt by all; and by the general chapter of the Dominican order one of their own body, Hugo de St. Chers (*a Sancto Caro*), so called from his birthplace, near Vienna, a man distinguished for his knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldee, afterwards elevated to the dignity of a cardinal, was appointed to prepare an improved edition of the Vulgate.[4] The same schoolman composed likewise a concordance and commentary on the Bible.

In the history of systematic theology, that extraordinary man, little known as a theologian,— whom we have so often had occasion to mention on account of his many-sided activity,— Raymund Lull, holds an important place. Although, as appears evident from the history of his life which we have given, he had not formed himself in the school of any one of the great teachers of his time, but was for the most part a self-taught man,— still, he must be regarded as one link in this connected series; and the great influence of the questions which occupied the theologians of his age is shown in his case also, in a way not to be mistaken. We have seen how intimately the speculative and practical were blended together in him; how his speculative turn entered even into his enthusiasm for the cause of missions, and his zeal as an apologist. His contests, growing out of this latter interest, with the school of Averrhoes, with the sect proceeding from that school which affirmed the irreconcilable opposition between faith and knowledge, would naturally lead him to make the relation subsisting between these two a matter of special investigation. It is true, the enthusiasm for truth which filled his mind, the union of a fervid imagination with

[1] Quod textus hic de ore Domini et sanctorum allatus mundo est, ita magnus, quod vix sufficeret alıquis lector ad perlegendum eum in tota vita sua.

[2] Opus majus, f. 189: Haec cognitio locorum mundi valde necessaria est reipublicae fidelium et conversioni infidelium, et ad obviandum infidelibus et antichristo. Qui loca mundi ignorat, nescit non solum quo vadit, sed quo tendat et ideo sive pro conversione infidelium proficiscatur aut pro aliis ecclesiae negotiis, necesse est, ut sciat ritus et conditiones omnium nationum, quatenus proposito certo locum proprium petat.

[3] He says in his tract already cited, de laude scripturae sacrae: A viginti retro annis inter minores et Scholares, potissimum vero praedicatores, mos insolevit, quod quilibet corrigat pro sua voluntate et quilibet mutat, quod non intelligit, quod non licet facere in libris poëtarum.

[4] The work sketched out by him in the year 1236: Sacra biblia recognita et emendata, id est, a scriptorum vitiis expurgata, additis ad marginem variis lectionibus codicum Mss. Hebraeorum, Graecorum, et veterum Latinorum codicum, aetate Caroli magni scriptorum.

logical formalism, led him to form extravagant hopes of a fancied absolute method adapted to all science,— applicable, also, to the truths of Christianity, and by which these truths might be demonstrated in a convincing manner to every man. Yet his writings generally abound — far more than that formal system of science, his *Ars magna* — in deep apologetic ideas. The enthusiasm of a most fervent love to God, a zeal equally intense for the cause of faith and the interests of reason and science, expressed themselves everywhere in his works.

We perceive some progress of systematic development in the fact that the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century, before proceeding to the treatment of particular subjects, busied themselves with preliminary inquiries respecting the idea and essence of theology itself; as to whether theology could be called a science, and in what sense; as to the relation in which its peculiar province stood to other departments of knowledge; as to the relation of faith to knowledge; as to the object-matter and the unity of theology; as to whether it was a speculative or a practical science. In their way of investigating and answering these questions, the same differences in the mode of apprehending the idea and essence of religion lie already at bottom, which became more fully and distinctly expressed in far later times. In general, they abode faithfully by the principle expressed by Augustin and Anselm, in making dogmatical knowledge proceed from the basis of Christian experience, and designating it as the special business of dogmatics scientifically to unfold and vindicate the matter received in and through faith.

This is distinctly expressed and profoundly set forth by the first of these theologians with whom we shall occupy ourselves, Alexander of Hales. "If we compare," says he, "the way in which the relation of faith or conviction to knowledge is determined in theology with the way in which it is done in the other sciences, we shall find that the order is a reverse one. In the other sciences, conviction is brought about by the activity of reason, or mediated by thought, and scientific knowledge precedes conviction; while the reverse holds true of religious matters. It is not till we have appropriated them by faith, that we can attain to a knowledge of them conformable to reason. These things can be understood only by those who are of a pure heart; and of this purity we become possessed by keeping God's commandments. The faith by which we come to conviction is the light of the soul: the more one is enlightened by this light, the more will his mind's eye be sharpened by it, to account for the matters believed on rational grounds."[1] He distinguishes a certainty of speculation, and a certainty of experience, a certainty grounded in the intellectual agencies, and another grounded in the feelings. Of the latter kind, is the certainty of faith; and, with reference to this kind of certainty,

[1] In Logicis ratio creat fidem, unde argumentum est ratio rei dubiae faciens fidem. In theologicis vero est converso, quia fides creat rationem, unde fides est argumentum faciens rationem. Fides enim qua creditur, est lumen animarum, quo quanto quis magis illustratur, tanto magis est perspicax ad inveniendas rationes, quibus probantur credenda.

theology is superior to the other sciences.[1] "Everything depends here on distinguishing one from another the different points of view, or positions occupied by the spiritual life. The same thing cannot be certain for all. The certainty of which we here speak, presupposes, as a subjectively conditioned certainty, resting on inward experience, a certain stage arrived at, and position occupied, by the higher life. That which is certain to the spiritual man, is by no means so to the natural man, who, as Paul says, perceives not the things of the Spirit." He distinguishes the science which aims to guide reason to the knowledge of the truth, from that which aims to excite the feelings of piety.[2] "But of what use is it," he goes on to ask, "for us to seek also to know, on rational grounds, that which is already certain to us by faith? It serves, in the first place, to advance our own progress. For we must ever strive to explore more deeply into the contents of the truth we have appropriated by faith; and the grace of faith affords the mind the light for this purpose. Next, it should serve to promote the faith of the simple. For as men are incited to love God by the bestowment of temporal blessings, so they may be led by rational grounds to a higher stage of faith. Again, it may be employed as a means of conducting unbelievers to the faith. Yet this can be only a preparation; for true faith, which alone is acceptable to God, does not rest on arguments of reason, but proceeds from the immediate contact of the spirit with the highest truth manifesting itself to the spirit.[3] It is like the relation of those Samaritans to the woman who first pointed them to Christ, when they said to her: "Now we believe, not because of thy sayings, but because we have heard him ourselves." He affirms that theology is more a matter of temper and disposition, than of systematic knowledge; it is rather wisdom than science [4] He particularizes Christ and the redemption, as the proper object of theology, the central point, to which everything else refers.[5]

With Alexander of Hales agrees Bonaventura. He distinguishes the position held by natural reason, and that of reason exalted by faith, to which is imparted on that very account the gift of a higher knowledge, a knowledge not grounded in its natural powers, but communicated to it by the illumination of the divine spirit. Faith elevates the soul to a point where it harmonizes with divine truths; science, to the point where it understands the matter believed. On the question, therefore, whether the truths of faith are above reason, we must carefully distinguish from one another these two positions.[6]

[1] The distinction between certitudo speculativa and certitudo experientiae, certitudo secundum intellectum and secundum affectum, quod est per modum gustus.

[2] Alius modus debet esse scientiae, quae habet informare affectum secundum pietatem, alius scientiae, quae habet informare intellectum solum ad cognoscendam veritatem.

[3] Habet rationem credendorum, non tamen ei innititur, imo acquiescit ipsi veritati per testimonium primae veritatis. Fides inspirata ad assentiendum primae veritati sive primo vero propter seipsum.

[4] Haec scientia magis est virtutis quam artis, et sapientia magis quam scientia.

[5] Theologia: scientia de substantia divina cognoscenda per Christum in opere reparationis.

[6] Credibile super rationem quantum ad scientiam acquisitam per rationem evidentem, non supra rationem elevatam per fidem et per donum scientiae et intellectus. Fides enim elevat ad assentiendum, scientia et intellectus elevant ad ea, quae credita sunt, intelligendum.

The worth of faith depends on the fact, that here, conviction is not determined by arguments of reason, but by love.[1] In theology, the theoretical and the practical, feeling and knowing, meet and unite together.[2] The truths of faith, though, like other truths, matters of knowledge, are distinguished from others in this respect, that, by their essence, they operate on the heart or the feelings.[3] Such a knowledge as this — Christ died for us — moves the heart, not hardened, to love and devotion, which cannot be said of mathematical truths.

Albert the Great also pronounces theology a practical science, because it has reference to that whereby man is to be rendered capable of attaining to his ultimate end, the bliss that consists in communion with God.[4] It is required as a complement to human knowledge. The light of natural reason is not sufficient for the knowledge of that which is necessary in order to our salvation; we need those truths, besides, which can be known only by supernatural light.[5]

All these theologians proceed on the assumption that, as man is destined for a supernatural end, transcending the limits of his nature, in which end he is to find his felicity, so he needs a supernatural means; a thought which, we allow, stands closely connected with the separation they make, in anthropology, between the natural and the supernatural, as it regards man's original state (of which, more hereafter). Accordingly, Thomas Aquinas endeavors to demonstrate in this way the necessity of a supernatural revelation for mankind; which necessity he deduces from the fact that the end for which man is destined lies beyond the reach of the natural creation. The speculative spirit of Thomas Aquinas, like that of Aristotle, whose opinion he here adopts, places contemplation as the highest end and good of the spirit. But then he distinguishes the contemplation of God, mediated through the knowledge of God by the creation, from that which springs from the immediate intuition of God's essence. As all creatures are endowed with the requisite powers and means for fulfilling their destination, so also is man in respect to the end corresponding to his nature, as it is in itself. This end, therefore, reason may arrive at, by the force that resides in itself; and this was the highest end known to the ancient philosophers, beyond which they could not go. But it is by faith we first come to the knowledge of that perfect contemplation of God which constitutes the bliss to which we shall arrive in our heavenly home. Now this highest supernatural end must have a corresponding means leading to it; that man may be led to it, not by

[1] Non assentit propter rationem, sed propter amorem ejus cui assentit.

[2] Cognitio et affectus.

[3] Fides sic est in intellectu, ut quantum est de sui ratione, nata sit, movere affectum.

[4] Finis, conjungi intellectu et affectu et substantia cum eo, quod colitur, prout est finis beatificans et ideo ista scientia proprie est affectiva id est veritatis, quae non sequestratur a ratione boni et ideo perficit et intellectum et affectum.

[5] Ex illuminatione connaturali nobis non sufficienter innotescunt, quae ad salutem necessaria sunt. Unde omnibus aliis traditis scientiis ista tanquam omnium perfectiva necessaria est, in qua supermundana illuminatione innotescunt ea, quae ad salutem hominis pertinent.

knowledge drawn from the works of creation, but by a knowledge given immediately by divine light. But, — aside from the consideration of the matter which is such as can become known to man only through a supernatural revelation, — even in reference to the knowledge of those truths which it is possible to reach by reason, the necessity of a revelation appears; for, without this, only a few men, capable of philosophical cultivation, and these only by means of a long and tedious course of mental development, could arrive at such knowledge. Moreover, the knowledge would not be so certain; it would be liable to be mixed up with many errors.[1] By virtue of this distinction between a supernatural and a natural end of man, he rebuts the objection often urged by those who stood on naturalistic or rationalistic grounds, against the reception of a supernatural revelation, namely, that it would be placing man below all the other creatures, to suppose him the only one not provided with all the requisite powers for attaining his ultimate end. The setting aside of this objection was provided for in the statement already made, that the end of human development reaches higher than the whole creation; and hence the necessity of a corresponding instrumentality.[2] In accordance with these premises, he goes on to remark, that "As the other sciences proceed from principles evidenced by the light of natural reason, so theology proceeds from principles made clear by the light of faith. We ought not to be surprised that those truths should be just as strange to unbelievers, as the truths of natural reason would be to us, without the light of natural reason. As, in the other sciences, it is impossible to argue from those highest principles with those who are not agreed in recognizing those principles, or with those who positively deny them; so no other means are left for convincing such as do not admit the fundamental truths themselves which are given by revelation."[3] Accordingly, he remarks of the attempts in the proper sense to demonstrate the Trinity by natural reasons: "That the interests of faith are thereby injured in two ways: first, the dignity of faith itself is impaired; for it has respect to things invisible, things exalted above reason, Heb. 11 : 1. Next, professing to demonstrate what it is impossible to demonstrate, the doctrines of faith are exposed to the ridicule of unbelievers, if the latter are so mistaken as to suppose that our faith reposes on such arguments."

As Thomas Aquinas, on the one hand, maintained that the doctrines of revelation are above reason, and, with a moderation the more to be admired, because it proceeded from a mind so acute and profoundly speculative by nature, endeavored to fix the boundaries of rational demonstration; so, on the other hand, he stood forth the opponent of a

[1] Ad ea etiam, quae de Deo ratione humana investigari possunt, necessarium fuit hominem instrui revelatione divina, quia veritas de Deo per rationem investigata a paucis et per longum tempus et cum admixtione multorum errorum homini proveniret.

[2] Illud, quod acquirit bonitatem perfectam pluribus auxiliis et motibus est nobilius eo quod imperfectam bonitatem acquirit paucioribus vel per seipsum, et hoc modo se habet homo respectu aliarum creaturarum, qui factus est ad ipsius divinae gloriae participationem.

[3] Quod sicut habitus principiorum primorum non acquiritur per alias scientias, sed habetur a natura, ita etiam in hac doctrina non acquiritur habitus fidei, qui est quasi habitus principiorum.

party who held, that an irreconcilable opposition existed between faith and reason. Those who affirmed this, were certainly not the advocates of an abrupt supernaturalism, but rather of a pantheistic and rationalistic infidelity, which came from Spain, having originated in the school of Averrhoes; and now, under the pretext of this irreconcilable opposition between revelation and reason, between theological and philosophical truth, was endeavoring to propagate itself. Under such an opposition might be concealed a negative tendency; negative, in that it afterwards bowed to the authority of the church, holding that from the church alone could be received those higher truths which contradicted natural reason. Thomas Aquinas maintained, in opposition to this tendency, that the truths of faith could not possibly contradict the fundamental axioms recognized as necessary truths by natural reason; for if they could, then since God, the author of our nature, implanted these truths in that nature, it would follow that God contradicted himself.[1] Besides, our minds would be hindered, by conflicting ideas, from making any progress in the knowledge of truth; a condition of being such as could not possibly proceed from God. That which is natural cannot be altered, so long as nature remains the same. But contradicting convictions cannot subsist together. Therefore, it would be impossible for a conviction to be imparted to man by God, which contradicts natural knowledge. To confirm this, he cites, with a profound sense of the spirit of the passage, Rom. 10: 8. That, however, which is *above* reason, is by many wrongly held to be *contradictory* to reason. From all this it follows, that the objections brought against the truths of faith can possess only a shadow of truth; they must be sophistical. And so reason, though she cannot, it is true, demonstrate the truths of faith which are above reason, may detect and expose the shallowness of the arguments brought against them.[2] As grace does not destroy nature, but completes it, so natural reason must be subservient to faith, as also the natural inclinations should be subservient to Christian love.[3] Here he applies the passage of Scripture which speaks of the bringing of reason into captivity to the obedience of faith, 2 Corinth. 10: 5. We shall, indeed, fully comprehend the truths of faith only then, when we shall have attained to the intuition of the divine essence; but reason, even here below, is doubtless competent to discover many analogies serving to illustrate them.[4] True, such analogies are insufficient to make these truths comprehensible; still, it is profitable for the human mind to exercise itself in such however feeble attempts, provided it does so without pretending to comprehend

[1] Principiorum autem naturaliter notorum cognitio nobis divinitus est indita, cum ipse Deus sit auctor nostrae naturae. Haec ergo principia etiam divina sapientia continet. Quicquid igitur principiis hujusmodi contrarium est, est divinae sapientiae contrarium, non igitur a Deo esse potest

[2] Cum enim fides infallibili veritati innitatur, impossibile autem sit, de vero demonstrari contrarium, manifestum est, probationes quae contra fidem inducuntur, non esse demonstrationes, sed solubilia argumenta.

[3] Cum gratia non tollat naturam, sed perficiat, oportet, quod naturalis ratio subserviat fidei, sicut et naturalis inclinatio voluntatis obsequitur caritati.

[4] Quod ad eam potest aliquas veras similitudines colligere.

or to demonstrate; because no higher source of enjoyment is to be found than that of being able to know even a small portion of the highest things. This should be used for the instruction and the comfort of believers, but not for the refutation of adversaries. — Although theology takes cognizance of a great variety of apparently foreign subjects, belonging to different parts of philosophy, still, in the opinion of Thomas Aquinas, its unity as a science is not at all impaired thereby; for everything in it is bound together by virtue of *one* formal relation. It treats, it is true, of God, and at the same time of the creature, though not after the same manner; but it treats everything with a like reference to God, as the principle and end of all,[1] and everything, so far as it may be contemplated, as what God has revealed. Theology, therefore, is a certain transcript of the divine knowledge; embracing within its compass all things, as God knows all things in knowing himself.[2] Since Thomas entertained the same views respecting the progressive stages of religious conviction, and respecting the relation of faith to knowledge, with the earlier scholastic theologians, he would be likely to decide as they did on the question whether theology is a *speculative* or a *practical* science. Still, he expresses himself differently, though without differing from them at bottom, in the views which he entertained. All depends on the meaning which he attaches to the word *theoretical*. Its meaning is determined, in his case, by the fact that he places the bliss of the righteous in the contemplation of God, representing everything else as means to form man for this ultimate end. "Although," says he, "theology contains much that belongs partly to speculative, partly to practical philosophy, still, it is more speculative than practical, because it occupies itself far more with divine things than with human actions, and treats of the latter only with reference to the end that man may be rendered capable thereby of that perfect knowledge in which consists eternal happiness."[3]

Profound discussions concerning the essence of religious conviction, concerning the idea of faith, and the process of its development, we find in William of Paris. The view of faith common to all these theologians, that it is a determination of the "intellect," proceeding from the heart, or disposition, is explicated by him in an original and lively manner. He distinguishes *that* conviction, which proceeds from objective truth through the medium of demonstration and thought, where the matter itself is so constituted as necessarily to produce acquiescence of the mind, and *that* conviction which proceeds from the subjective temper of the heart, the bent of the will, which determines man to adopt, among his convictions, even that which, in itself, may not appear credible to the natural "intellect."[4] Hence faith is to be denominated

[1] Non determinat de Deo et de creaturis aequo, sed de Deo principaliter et de creaturis secundum quod referuntur ad Deum, ut ad principium vel finem.

[2] Ut sit sacra doctrina sic velut quaedam impressio divinae scientiae, quae est una simplex omnium.

[3] Quia principalius agit de rebus divinis, quam de actibus humanis, de quibus agit, secundum quod per eos ordinatur homo ad perfectam Dei cognitionem, in qua aeterna beatitudo consistit.

[4] Aliud est credere ex probabilitate sive ex evidentia ipsius crediti, aliud ex virtute credentis. De fide, c. i

a virtue, — the force of a temper exercising its power over the "intellect," enabling reason to overcome the darkness pressing in upon it from without, to overcome the reaction of doubt, and shedding its own light upon that which, in itself, would appear dark, so that it becomes light and clear to the mind.[1] If the entire human soul is to be received into glory, and the necessary medium for its glorification in that life is grace in this, and the intellect is to share in the same glory with the other powers, then the intellect must first be clothed upon with grace in the present life, and this is the work of faith. If the human soul ought to be governed by religion, and nothing foreign from religion ought to abide in it, then the eye of the soul itself, the "intellect," should be governed by religion; but faith is, of necessity, the whole religion of the "intellect," or the first thing in it. Furthermore, man is bound to deny himself and submit to God as well with the bent of the "intellect" as of the "affections." But on the part of the "intellect," this act is none other than that which is denoted by the term "faith." This theologian, therefore, reckons to the essence of faith the conflict with self, and considers self-denial as the negative moment in the act by which reason submits to God. Faith, according to him, can only arise and assert itself in contest with the reactions of natural reason, which will not let man receive that which does not harmonize with itself. Conflict and warfare belong to the essence of faith.[2] Faith is strong in proportion as conviction proceeds from its own inward energy, and requires no other supports, such as arguments of reason or miracles, which are merely crutches to uphold the weak in faith. More sublime, more noble and certain, is that knowledge which proceeds from a virtue, than that which proceeds from a science; because virtue is something more inward, more deep-rooted in the very essence of the mind itself.[3] As religious faith is a light flowing directly from the very fountain of light, so it is a higher thing than the light, which comes through the medium and reflection of something else, as in science and in every other sort of conviction.[4] This faith (living faith) is not merely a light, by which the matter believed is revealed, but also a life, which impels to the doing of that which is believed, and to the eschewing of the contrary.[5] It is a life-giving ray from the fountain-source of life, — a part of that life

[1] Manifestum, quod credere improbabilia fortitudinis est atque vigoris nostri intellectus, sicut amare molesta et ignominiosa fortudinis est et vigoris nostri affectus. Fortitudo intellectus, quae tenebras improbabilitatis irrumpat et vincat et luminositate propria ea, quae illa abscondere contendit lucida et aperta, hoc est credita faciat.

[2] De operationibus intellectus solum credere bellum habet, omne bellum bellica virtute seu fortitudine agendum est. Virtus or fortitudo intellectus manifests itself in faith. It is evident how intimately connected with his views of the nature of faith were the remarks with which this bishop endeavored to comfort a clergyman (see on a former page, 326) who was troubled with doubts.

[3] Propter hoc virtus est certior quam ars, quia intimior et hoc utroque modo, quia magis profundans in nos, magis enim penetrat mentem et inficit virtus quam ars, et a profundioribus rerum ipsarum (that which is the most profound in the things themselves) est.

[4] Cum ipsa descendat a primo lumine, nobilior est atque sublimior, quam scientiae vel credulitates, quae a rebus per reflexionem illuminationis, quam a lumine primo recipiunt, ad intellectum nostrum accedunt.

[5] Non solum modo lumen ad ostendendum credita, sed etiam vita, ad movendum ad illa facienda vel declinanda.

itself which is denominated the life of faith, descending on the intellect, that head of the human soul, for the purpose of quickening, establishing, and arming it. Dead faith, if faith it may be called, he compares with those motions or spasmodic contractions, resembling life, which may sometimes be observed in the limbs of animals that are dead.[1]

It is evident from what has already been said concerning the scientific bent of Roger Bacon, that *he* could not tolerate any schism between faith and knowledge, but would look upon Christianity, — which, in his view, should appropriate to itself all that is true in that earlier, preparatory evolution, the philosophy of antiquity, — would look upon this as the perfection of science. "All truth," he says, "springs from the same source, from the divine light which, according to the gospel of St. John, enlightens every man that cometh into the world. Human reason is only a capacity to be filled, and knowledge can be imparted to it only by *that* reason which alone is reason *in actu*."[2] He adduces the testimony of Augustin, that men know whatever they know of truth, only in the eternal truth and the eternal laws.[3] Now as God enlightened the souls of the philosophers in the knowledge of certain truths, so their labors are not foreign and aside from the divine wisdom.[4] The *practical* is what Bacon contemplates as the *ultimate* end to which all else must be subservient. The will or practical reason is something higher than the speculative reason; virtue and bliss are infinitely superior to mere knowledge, and far more necessary for us.[5] Hence speculative philosophy stands, to moral philosophy, in the relation of a means to an end; and its end is, to prepare principles for the latter. But that which unbelievers consider as moral philosophy, is, with Christian philosophers, in the proper and complete sense, theology. Philosophy respects that which is common to all things and sciences; hence it determines the number of the sciences, and the peculiar province of each; it must therefore, by the consciousness of its own inadequacy to reach the knowledge of those things which it is most necessary for man to know, come to see that there must be a science exalted above philosophy, whose peculiar nature it describes generally, though it cannot set forth its particular contents.[6] This higher science is the science that treats of divine things; and it can proceed only from Christianity.

[1] Sic et mortuo intellectu per extinctionem fidei aliqui similes motus inveniuntur, non autem motus perfecti, ut ambulatio, quae non invenitur in animali mortuo, neque volatus.

[2] The distinction between the intellectus agens, *ἐνεργείᾳ, ποιητικός*, and the intellectus possibilis, *δυνάμει, παθητικός*, according to Aristotle. Roger Bacon contends against that view according to which only two different spheres are thereby denoted in the human soul itself, as Aristotle certainly affirms in his work on the soul, iii. 5. See Trendelenburg on this place. He supposes, on the contrary, that, under the intellectus agens, must be conceived an intellectus different from the human soul, influens et illuminans possibilem intellectum ad cognitionem veritatis.

[3] Quod non cognoscimus aliquam veritatem nisi in veritate increata et in regulis aeternis.

[4] Opus majus, p. ii, c. v.

[5] Voluntas seu intellectus practicus nobilior quam speculativus et virtus cum felicitate excellet in infinitum scientiam nudam et nobis est magis necessaria sine comparatione. P. iii, f. 47.

[6] Quod oportet esse aliam scientiam ultra philosophiam, cujus proprietates tangit in universali, licet in particulari non possit eam assignare.

Roger Bacon distinguishes this province of philosophy, perfected by Christianity, from the province of theology, which concerns itself with the exposition of the truths of faith communicated by revelation. This Christian philosophy stands, according to him, in the same relation to theology in which speculative philosophy, in the ante-Christian times stood to moral philosophy.[1] It adopts that which is true from the earlier speculation, and with it unites those truths, to the consciousness of which reason first attained under the light of Christianity by virtue of the impulse given to it by the same, but to the recognition of which reason may now be led of itself, though it was not competent to discover them of itself. Thus will this Christian philosophy lead to faith, while it takes nothing from the articles of faith, for the purposes of proof, but employs many common truths of reason, which any wise man would easily recognize when presented before him by another, although he would never have come to the knowledge of them, if left to himself.[2] And this it must do, not only in order to the completion of philosophy, but also on account of the Christian consciousness, whose office it is to conduct all truth up to divine truth, so that the one may be subjected and rendered subservient to the other.[3]

Roger Bacon did not otherwise depart, however, in his general mode of apprehending the idea of that which properly constitutes faith, from the theologians of this century. He too made reason (*ratio*) proceed from the faith (*fides*), that had grown out of another process of development; though Christian philosophy, which is indebted to faith alone for its existence, may, as he supposes, be to others a preparation for faith, in order to which, however, still more than itself is required. "A great joy," says he, "we may gain for our faith, when philosophers, who follow only the decisions of reason, agree with us, and so confirm the confession of the Christian faith; not that we are to seek after rational grounds before faith, but only after it; so that, made sure by a double confirmation, we praise God for our salvation, which we can hold fast without wavering."[4]

In Raymund Lull we have seen, already, when contemplating his missionary labors, the zealous opponent of the doctrine, which affirmed the existence of a necessary schism between faith and knowledge. Glowing love to God, imparted life to his intellect; but that love would tolerate nothing foreign beside it. It absorbed every power of

[1] Speculatio Christianorum praecedens legem suam debet super speculationem alterius legis addere ea, quae valent ad legem Christi docendam et probandam, ut surgat una speculatio completa, cujus initium erit speculativa philosophorum infidelium et complementum ejus superinductum theologiae et secundum proprietatem legis Christianae.

[2] Philosophi infideles multa ignorant in particulari de divinis, quae si proponerentur iis, ut probarentur per principia philosophiae completae, hoc est per vivacitates rationis, quae sumunt originem a philosophia infidelium, licet complementum a fide Christi, reciperent sine contradictione, et gaudent de proposita sibi veritate, quia avidi sunt et magis studiosi quam Christiani Also, from what is here said, we may perceive, as well as from what we have earlier remarked, that Roger Bacon must have agreed with Raymund Lull in his view of the relation of science to missions.

[3] Propter conscientiam Christianam, quae habet omnem veritatem ducere ad divinam, ut ei subjiciatur et famuleter. Opus majus, f. 41, seqq.

[4] L. c. f. 160.

the soul into itself. God, of whom he was certain, as the object of his enthusiastic love, he was desirous of having also as an object of knowledge; with the collected energy of all its powers would his great mind soar upward to him. The longing of his love aspired beyond the limits of this earthly existence, and would antedate the intuition of the eternal life. "Elevate thy knowledge," says he,[1] "and thy love will be elevated. Heaven is not so lofty as the love of a holy man. The more thou wilt labor to rise upward, the more shalt thou rise upward."[2] In a tract finished at Montpellier, in the year 1304, "On the agreement between faith and knowledge,[3]" he relates the following story, to show what an obstacle the pretended opposition between faith and knowledge was to the spread of Christianity. Miramolin, a certain king of Tunis, well skilled in logic and natural science, once had a dispute with a monk, who with several others visited his country for the purpose of establishing a mission in it. This monk was well versed in morals and history, and also in the Arabic language; but he had little knowledge of logic and natural science. On the score of morals the monk showed, conclusively, that Mohammed's doctrines were false; whereupon the prince declared that he was ready to become a Christian if the monk could prove to him the truth of the Christian doctrine. Said the latter, "The Christian doctrine is too exalted to be proved by argument: Believe only, and thou shalt be saved. To this the king replied, "That is but a positive thing; in that way, I should be unwilling to exchange my own faith for another." He was now neither Christian, Saracen, nor Jew,— and he expelled those missionaries from his kingdom.[4] Raymund distinguishes different degrees of the *credere* and the *intelligere;* consequently, also, different ways and manners in which one conditions the other, and in which the *intelligere* depends on the *credere* as its necessary presupposition: hence, the different sense which he gives to the commonly received proposition, "If thou believest not, thou canst not understand." In the first place, the mind cannot have an understanding of the truths of faith, so long as it is thoroughly prejudiced against them; and, assuming that they involve impossibilities, will not cease from its repugnance to them. The first step in order to arrive at a certain understanding, and to attain from this point to faith, is to get free from that prejudice of hostility to the truth, — to suppose, or presume for the present, that the object-matter of faith is not impossible, so that the way may be open for inquiry.[5] The mind being essentially the same in unbelievers and believers, the former must be capable of convincing themselves of the

[1] In the first part of his tract De centum nominibus Dei, Opp. t. vi.

[2] Eleva tuum intelligere et elevabis tuum amare. Coelum non est tam altum, sicut amare sancti hominis. Quo magis laborabis ad ascendendum, eo magis ascendes.

[3] De convenientia fidei et intellectus in objecto, t. iii.

[4] Raymund heard this from the mouth of the man himself. "Et ego vidi fratrem cum suis sociis et sum locutus cum ipsis."

[5] In quantum intellectus supponit in principio, quando inquirit, possibile esse, habet modum inquirendi veritatem, quam supponit, et si per credulitatem affirmat, in Deo non esse trinitatem, non potest ulterius progredi, quia non habet modum inquirendi. Vide the tract De anima rationali, p. xi, opp. t. vi, f. 51.

truths of faith, if only they are so disposed; but investigation is impossible, unless it be assumed that a thing is either true or false.[1] Such is the action and reaction between truth and falsehood, that one is proved or destroyed with the other. He starts the query,[2] whether God is more an object of faith than of knowledge,[3] which he answers in the negative; and whether exaltation of knowledge is the diminution of faith,[4] which also he answers in the negative. Knowledge and faith harmonize together, because both are acts of the mind, and the higher the mind rises in the knowledge of God, the higher it rises also in faith, and the converse.[5] If it were not to be presumed that man may attain in the present life to the knowledge of the divine Trinity, of the incarnation of God, and of the other articles of faith, lest he might lose the merit of faith, then it would follow that the ultimate end of man's creation is, that he may attain to great merit and great glory, and not that God may be greatly known and loved by man: that the end, therefore, is rather that men may be glorified than that God may be known and loved. He treats of the same subject in a disputation which he held with an anchoret on some doubtful questions in the Sentences of Peter Lombard.[6] He relates that while he was studying at Paris, looking at the wretched condition of the world, he was deeply pained; and particularly when he found that, by means of the *Ars generalis*, given him for the purpose of enlightening the darkness of this world, he had not succeeded as yet in advancing the interests of Christ's church as he wished to do. Full of these painful thoughts, he once left the city and wandered away alone by the banks of the Seine, reflecting within himself how the evil could be remedied. There he found an anchoret, resting under the shade of a tree; one, who, after having long pursued his studies at Paris, had retired to this spot, for the purpose of searching after the truth. This solitary proposed to him many doubts relative to the work on the Sentences, which he, with the help of the principles of his *Ars generalis*, promised to resolve.[7] Among these, was the question, whether theology is properly a science. He distinguishes, for the purpose of satisfactorily answering this question, what belongs to a thing, as to its essence and idea, and what takes place only under certain circumstances and relations.[8] To the mind (*intellectus*) belongs, in the former sense, only the *intelligere;* in the other sense, faith. Only when the mind is prevented, by certain hindrances, from rising to knowledge, faith takes its place, so that the mind by this means may lay hold of the truth.[9] As in the absence of an object of sensuous

[1] De contemplatione Dei, vol. ii, lib. iii, Distinct. 29, c. lxxiii, t. ix, f. 409.

[2] T. iv, Quaestio 201.

[3] Magis credibilis quam intelligibilis.

[4] Qu. 202: Utrum exaltatio cognitionis intellectus sit diminutio fidei.

[5] Ita credere et scire habent concordantiam secundum suos actus et habitus et secundum suas potentias.

[6] Disputatio eremitae et Raymundi super aliquibus dubiis quaestionibus sententiarum Petri Lombardi.

[7] He says, Ars generalis, quam mihi Deus ostendit in quodam monte.

[8] Proprie and appropriate.

[9] Credere est illi appropriatum, per supremum objectum, ut per fidem possit attingere illam veritatem, quam demonstra

perception, the image of it in the fancy takes its place, so when the thinking mind is hindered from gaining a knowledge of the doctrines of faith by the necessary principles of truth, — as in the case of day laborers, women, peasants, and others, who can only hold fast to what is taught them, — the truth presents itself to the mind only in the form of faith.[1] But theology is in the proper sense a science, because *intelligere* belongs in the proper sense to the essence of the "intellect," still more than *to warm* belongs to the essence of fire; *to see*, to the essence of the eye. As God is, in the highest sense, good and great, he communicates himself to the created intellect in proportion to its capacity of receiving into itself his image and perfections. If it belongs to the very essence of mind, that it should know those objects, for knowing which it properly was not created, how much more should its essence be directed to the end of knowing the highest objects for which it was preëminently created? Raymund holds that the end for which mind was created, is to refer itself with all its powers to God: it were impossible, therefore, that any power of the mind should be able to appropriate to itself other objects than those highest, for which the mind, as to its essence, was created.[2] He brings up the possible objections to this position: for example, that it would follow from it, that man's finite mind may comprehend the infinite. "This," says he, "would by no means follow. If we tasted a drop of sea-water, we should infer at once, from its saltness, that the water of the sea generally is salt; still, we should know this better, if we could taste *all* the water of the sea." So he supposes that the human mind, though, as he acknowledges himself, the comparison is not altogether apposite,[3] attains to a knowledge of the Trinity that is sufficient for it; but can attain to nothing beyond this. Such knowledge is beyond all comparison less in relation to the whole, than the drop in relation to the sea.[4] How far he was from believing it possible to obtain an absolute knowledge of the being of God, is evident from the fact that he supposes one great end of the striving after such a knowledge to be, that the mind might become conscious of its own limit.[5] The more it strives, the more it learns to adore the incomprehensible glory of the divine essence.[6] He was the less capable of admitting the possibility of an absolute knowledge of the essence of God, because he did not

tive non potest attingere propter aliquod impedimentum, quod habet ratione subjecti, aut materiale.

[1] Restauratur veritas articulorum in credulitate intellectus, qui ipsam credit.

[2] Aliud objectum illi minus principale esset illi magis appetibile, quam suum objectum magis principale, quod esset impossibile, et idem esset suo modo de voluntate, cui theologia non esset proprium objectum ad amandum et sic de memoria ad recolendum, quod est valde inconveniens.

[3] Licet exemplum sit grossum, cum de Deo et creatura non possimus aequaliter exemplificare.

[4] Sicut (et multo minus sine aliqua comparatione) tuus gustus non comprehendit totam aquam maris.

[5] Words to God: Secunda intentio, quare tuus subditus inquirit habere cognitionem de tua honorata essentia est, ut possit captivare et terminare virtutes suae animae in inquisitione, quam faciet, quia intrat in inquisitionem, in qua deficiet sua cognitio et omnes suae virtutes.

[6] Quo plus anima deficit in attingendo et sciendo esse tuae essentiae, eo plus cognoscit excellentiam ipsius, quae est adeo magna et adeo nobilis, quod nulla anima possit sufficere ad percipiendum et attingendum totam ipsam

admit the possibility of such a knowledge even with regard to the essence of the soul itself. After having pointed out four respects, in which a knowledge of the soul is possible to man, he names a fifth in which it cannot be an object of human knowledge, namely, the soul, considered as to its intrinsic essence.[1]

Raymund composed a tract on the Strife between faith and the understanding.[2] The understanding says to faith: You are the preparatory step by which I arrive at the right state of mind, in order to rise to the contemplation of the highest things." The "habit" of faith passes over to the understanding,[3] and thus faith is in the understanding and the understanding in faith. While the understanding is rising by knowledge to that stage where faith already stands, faith, by believing, rises from this point to a still higher stage above the understanding.[4] The understanding says to faith: "As oil swims on the water, so thy place is always above mine. And the reason is, because it is thy nature to ascend, and it costs thee no labor; while I must toil incessantly, that, by knowing, I may mount a little higher." So the buoyancy of faith sets it constantly above the efforts of thought. In his principal work (*De Contemplatione*),[5] "On the harmony and opposition between faith and rational knowledge,"[6] he says: "Faith *stands* in lofty things, and chooses never to descend to rational grounds, while reason *soars upward* to lofty things, which she then brings down to understanding and knowledge. When faith stands in lofty things and reason soars up to her, then both are in harmony, because faith gives elevation to reason, and reason is energized and ennobled by the lofty aspiring of faith, so as to attempt to master by knowledge what faith has already reached by believing. And if reason cannot ascend to those heights which faith has attained, yet the more reason elevates itself and puts forth its efforts, to know those exalted things, the higher does faith mount upward. Hence, reason and faith mount upwards by help of each other; hence, there is harmony and good-will between them, and they mutually strengthen each other. As it is the nature and property of fire to ascend higher than the other elements, so it is the nature of faith to soar higher than reason, because the activity of reason in man is compounded of sense and intellect; but the activity of faith is not a compound but a simple thing. It dwells above the loftiest summits of the known intelligible.[7]

[1] Si postea inquirat, quid sit essentia animae in se ipsa, deficit suus intellectus et sua perceptio et non potest ultra progredi per cognitionem, imo retrocedit per ignorantiam, quo plus vult inquirere istam quintam rem, quam homo non potest cognoscere in praesenti vita in rebus spiritualibus. De contemplatione in Deum, lib. iii, c. clxxvi, t. ix, f. 420.

[2] Disputatio fidei et intellectus, finished at Montpellier in October of the year 1303.

[3] Quod tu fides sis dispositio et praeparatio, per quam ego de Deo sum dispositus ad altas res, nam in hoc quod ego per te suppono credendo, per quod possum ascendere, habituo me de te et sic tu es in me et ego in te.

[4] Quando ascendo in gradum, in quo tu es, intelligendo, tu ascendis credendo in altiorem gradum supra me.

[5] Distinct. 28, c. clvi, f. 354.

[6] Concordantiae et contrarietates inter fidem et rationem.

[7] Fides habet naturam ascendendi altius quam ratio, quia operatio rationis in homine est composita ex sensualitate et intellectualitate, sed operatio fidei non est composita, imo est res simplex et stans super extremitates intellectualitatum intellectarum.

No real opposition can exist between faith and reason. Nothing false, nothing concerning which reason might show that it contradicts our ideas of divine perfection, can be an object of faith. Faith calls forth reason from potential to actual existence ;[1] when faith, in conformity to reason, embraces the law of religion with love ; and reason calls forth faith from potential to actual existence, by proving that man is bound in reason to believe those articles, which by reason alone he could never come to the knowledge of. While reason confines the understanding within the limits prescribed to it by nature, because she has no means of extending them further, true faith gives freedom and largeness to the understanding, because she does not allow it to be confined to the limits within which reason has inclosed it."[2] Raymund distinguishes[3] potential faith, actual faith, and a third kind, which, as it proceeds from the potential and the actual, stands midway between the two. Actual faith and reason cannot be together at once in relation to the same object ; rational knowledge cannot gain entrance into the soul unless it has been evacuated and filled with knowledge by faith.[4] Although reason does not employ itself on the objects of faith, when it reflects on other things, yet faith, in the third sense, still abides in the soul.[5] In the present life, faith must take the place of reason, because the latter, through defect arising from the body, cannot always be active. It will be otherwise in the life eternal, when reason will be wholly glorified in union with the divine essence.[6] False faith may acquire great power by custom and education, so that every faculty of the soul may be under its sway ; but, by the force of necessary rational grounds,[7] this false faith, that has become a man's nature, may be banished from the soul ; for reason possesses more power over the soul of man than custom and education.

Having thus presented the characteristic features of the general directions and tendencies of the theological spirit, we now proceed to the exposition of the several parts in detail ; and first, to the doctrine concerning God, where Anselm of Canterbury is to be mentioned as the author of the ontological proof of the existence of God. As we have already remarked generally in speaking of him, we must, in order to understand and appreciate him rightly, carefully distinguish the ideas lying at bottom and closely cohering with his whole philosophico-theological bent, — from the syllogistic form, under which all that

[1] Facit venire rationem de potentia in actum.

[2] Sicut ratio captivat et incarcerat intellectum hominis intra terminos, intra quos est terminatus, quia non habet, cum quo eos possit ampliare et extendere, ita vera fides liberat et magnificat ipsum intellectum, quia non constringit eum intra terminos, intra quos ratio habet eum terminatum.

[3] T. x, Distinct, 36, c. ccxxxviii.

[4] Non potest in animum intrare ratio, nisi evacuando eam fide et implendo scientia et cognitione.

[5] Remanet et non privatur suo esse.

[6] Cap. ccxxxix : Quia anima non potest habere suas virtutes in actu, dum est in corpore sine adjutorio ipsius, propterea fides est in homine per hoc, quod ratio per defectum corporis non possit esse semper in actu, sed non erit in alio saeculo, quia impossibile erit, in eo esse fidem tam actualiter quam potentialiter, quod ratio semper erit actualiter et nunquam privabitur actualitate, imo continuo et in finite glorificabitur in tua essentia divina.

[7] Propinquiorem potentiae rationali

sprang out of these ideas was digested and unfolded. We find already, in Augustin, those fundamental ideas which Anselm has unfolded in his work *De veritate*, and in his *Monologium*. As a defender of realism in opposition to nominalism, Anselm stood up for a higher objectivity and necessity in human thought, which he derives from the relation existing at bottom between the human spirit and the Supreme Spirit, from whom all truth proceeds. "The creaturely mind can create nothing, but only perceive that which is communicated to it by the revelation of the Supreme Mind.[1] Whatever is true and good leads upward to the primal Source of all that is true and good, whose revelation all truth and goodness is. All truth presupposes an unchangeable, necessary Being, without which there would be no truth. Without God, no truth; truth in thought presupposes truth of being.[2] As all other knowing and thinking presuppose the idea of God, so this idea in the human mind carries the evidence of its reality in itself. As everything else testifies of it and presupposes it, it can itself be derived from no other source than from an original revelation to the human spirit from the spirit to whom it corresponds.[3] The idea of God is, therefore, a necessary and undeniable one; the denial of it involves a self-contradiction. The fool may, indeed, say within himself, There is no God, but he cannot actually think there is no God (Ps. 53 : 1). It is one thing to repeat over the words to one's self,— to present the thought so far as the form, the mere signs, are concerned; but it is quite another, to take up the contents of the thought into one's consciousness, which is actual thought. As it is impossible that fire should really be thought water, so it is impossible that God should really be denied by thought."[4]

We must distinguish the idea of the absolute, and the idea of the living God,— that which is undeniable to the thinking reason, and that which is so to the religious consciousness. But Anselm, having blended and confounded together the logical and religious elements, holds them inseparably united. The idea of the absolute, undeniable to the thinking reason, is with him transformed at once into the idea of the living God, undeniable to the religious consciousness. The *logical* necessity grounded in the laws of human thought, and the *real* necessity grounded in the essence,— the totality of human nature, with him, coalesce together. Again, after he had recognized the necessity, thus

[1] Lux illa, de qua micat omne verum, quod rationali menti lucet. Monolog. c. xiv.

[2] Omnes de veritate significationis loquuntur, veritatem vero, quae est in rerum essentia, pauci considerant. De veritate, c. ix. Cum veritas, quae est in rerum existentia, sit effectus summae veritatis, ipsa quoque causa est veritatis, quae cognitionis est, et ejus, quae est in propositione.

[3] An non invenit anima Deum, quem invenit esse lucem et veritatem? Quomodo namque intellexit hoc, nisi videndo lucem et veritatem? Aut potuit omnino aliquid intelligere de te, nisi per lucem tuam et veritatem tuam? Proslogium, c. xiv.

[4] Aliter cogitatur res, cum vox eam significans cogitatur, aliter cum id ipsum, quod est res, intelligitur. Illo itaque modo potest cogitari Deus non esse, isto vero minime. Nullus quippe intelligens id quod sunt ignis et aqua, potest cogitare ignem esse aquam secundum rem, licet hoc possit secundum voces. Ita igitur nemo intelligens id quod Deus est, potest cogitare quia Deus non est, licet haec verba dicat in corde, aut sine ulla aut cum aliqua extranea significatione. Proslog. c. iv.

grounded in the essence of the mind,— of presupposing the existence of God, he should for that very reason have been deterred from any attempt to prove it in the same manner as he would prove anything else. He should have been satisfied to lead back the mind into itself, into the depths of its own proper essence, in order that it might become conscious to itself of this necessity. But Anselm, who imagined that he was bound to prove, in strict syllogistic form, whatever presented itself to him as necessary truth, now seeks, from this position as a starting-point, to make out an argument by which the existence of God, and everything it is necessary to know respecting the divine attributes, should be demonstrated by one brief and summary process.[1] This thought did not allow him any rest, day or night; it disturbed, which grievously annoyed him, his hours of devotion. He had already begun, therefore, to look upon it as a temptation from Satan, and strove to banish the idea from his mind. But the more he strove against it the more closely it pursued him, so that he could not keep it away at all; till one night, while he was observing his vigils, the light suddenly burst upon his soul like a flash, and he was enraptured with the thought that he had discovered the long-sought argument. Thus arose his ontological proof at first, in the following form: "God is the most perfect of beings, than whom nothing higher can be conceived; but that which has actual existence is something higher than that which is barely conceived; therefore, from the idea of such a highest being, follows also his existence. Else, he would not be that which the idea asserts; it would in fact be possible to conceive of something higher; namely, the most perfect essence as existing;"[2] a form of proof which, as such, is certainly chargeable with the fallacy of a *petitio principii*. It is one in which things differing in kind — the *conception*, complete in all its characters, and *existence*, which does not belong among these characters — are confounded together. Nevertheless, faulty as this form of proof was, in a formal point of view, still, at the bottom of it lay this truth: that to the creaturely reason it is necessary to recognize an absolute being, to which it must feel bound to subject itself; just as we find it expressed in the following words of one of his prayers,— words which evidence how intimately the religious and philosophical elements were blended together in his case: "Thou art so truthful, O Lord, my God, that non-existence cannot even be conceived of thee; and with good reason, — for if any spirit could conceive anything better than thyself, the creature might rise superior to the Creator, and pass judgment on him."

The monk Gaunilo[3] stood forth as Anselm's opponent: and he suc-

[1] Eadmer de vita Anselmi: Incidit sibi in mentem, investigare, utrum uno solo et brevi argumento probari posset, id quod de Deo creditur et praedicatur.

[2] Anselm in his Proslogium: Convincitur insipiens, esse vel in intellectu aliquid, quo nihil majus cogitari potest, quia hoc, cum audit, intelligit, et quicquid intelligitur, in intellectu est, et certe id, quo majus cogitari nequit, non potest esse in intellectu solo. Si enim vel in solo intellectu est, potest, cogitari esse et in re, quod majus est. Si ergo id, quo majus cogitari non potest, est in solo intellectu, id ipsum, quo majus cogitari non potest, est, quo majus cogitari potest, sed certe hoc esse non potest.

[3] In his Liber pro insipiento.

ceeded in detecting the fallacy in the form of the argument: "It was as if one should describe the magnificence of a lost island, and then, from the fact that I was able to conceive of such an island, infer its existence." We must admit, however, there is a difference between the case of some contingent thing, and that of the idea of the absolute. For the rest, even Gaunilo, who distinguished himself by the dignified tone of his polemics, felt — although he did not dwell upon it — that it was necessary to distinguish, in Anselm's case, between what existed in the depths of his own immediate religious consciousness and what he set forth in the syllogistic form. It was necessary to acknowledge that Anselm was right at bottom, and in his design, but failed only in the *form* of his argument.[1] Anselm defended the form of his argument against Gaunilo, in his *Liber apologeticus*. The comparison of the idea of the absolute with the image of a lost island, he could not look upon as of any force. "If that could be predicated," says he, "of such a lost island,— which holds good of the idea of the absolute alone, namely, that it is that than which nothing greater can be conceived,— then, beyond a doubt, existence would be implied in the conception."[2]

The scholastics of the thirteenth century understood very well how to separate the false from the true in Anselm's argumentation. Alexander of Hales distinguishes, in the first place, two kinds of knowledge; knowledge in act, and knowledge in habit (*cognitio in actu et in habitu*), an idea fully unfolded in consciousness, and an idea lying at the bottom, in consciousness, as an undeveloped germ. It is in the latter and not the former way, that the idea of God is always present in the human mind. It is something original and undeniable to the human spirit,— that which meets and answers to the original revelation of the highest truth to the human mind.[3] While he supposes such a *habitus naturaliter impressus primae veritatis* in the human mind, he presupposes also an original correlation, at bottom, of the human mind to this *prima veritas*,— an original connection between the human spirit and the Supreme, absolute Spirit. "Yet," he remarks, "it does not follow from this fundamental relation that all men become conscious to themselves of the idea of God, and that it meets with recognition from them as an actual reality; for with regard to this knowledge in act (*cognitio in actu*), we must distinguish two separate tendencies of the soul, according as either the higher faculty of reason is developed and active in it,— and it is directed upon that original revelation of God, hence perceives it, since the mind cannot avoid being conscious of that which is the principle of its own essence,— or the lower powers only are active, as in the case of the soul that surrenders itself to earthly

[1] His words: Caetera libelli illius, pii ac sancti affectus intimo quodam odore fragrantia, ut nullo modo propter illa, quae in initiis recte quidem sensa, sed minus firmiter argumentata sunt, ista sint contemnenda.

[2] Fidens loquor, quia si quis invenerit mihi aliquid aut reipsa aut sola cogitatione existens, praeter quod majus cogitari non possit, cui aptare valeat connexionem hujus meae cogitationis, inveniam et dabo illi perditam insulam amplius non perdendam.

[3] Cognitio de Deo in habitu naturaliter nobis impressa, habitus naturaliter nobis impressus primae veritatis in intellectu, quo potest convincere, ipsum esse et non potest ipsum ignorari ab anima rationali.

things when the consciousness of God is repressed in it by this predominantly worldly tendency,— and so, the fool may deny the existence of God."[1] Again, he distinguishes in relation to knowledge, a common and a particular reason (*ratio communis* and a *ratio propria*),— the idea, as a universal, and its particular application. So he recognizes also, in the worship of God, the idea of God, in its universal essence, lying at the ground ; some error, only in its application.

Thomas Aquinas says: "The knowledge of God is, in a certain general and confused way, implanted in all,[2] in that man is so created that he can find his happiness only in God, and the craving after happiness resides by nature in all men ; yet, although the longing after the highest good can find its satisfaction only in God, many do not attain to this consciousness." He does not admit the validity of Anselm's argument from the idea to the reality.[3]

We see, in the history of the world, fundamental tendencies, in their incipient stages, announcing their presence by various signs,— seeking to start forth, and continually repressed again by mightier forces ere they can succeed to push their way through and assert themselves in opposition to these forces. Thus Christian theism, which in the first centuries had come off victorious in the contest with absolute dualism, had now to enter into another contest with absolute monism or pantheism. This latter theory might seek to fasten itself on Christianity at that point where it stands forth in antagonism to abstract deism and absolute dualism. Thus we discerned such an appearance already in the system of John Scotus Erigena; this century, however, was too little prepared as yet for such a speculative direction of thought either to adopt or to understand it. It passed away at this time, without leaving a vestige behind. But the speculative spirit, that went over from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, had prepared the way for it, so that the work in which John Scotus had unfolded his system could acquire an influence in the thirteenth century which it was unable to exercise at the time of its first appearance. This influence was promoted by the theology of the pseudo-Dionysian writings (which were themselves among the elements whence the system of Scotus had sprung), by the writings of the new Platonicians and of the Arabian philosophers,[4] circulated in Latin translations, and particularly by the

[1] Cognitio in actu duplex est, una est, cum movetur anima secundum partem superiorem rationis et habitum similitudinis primae veritatis superiori parti rationis impressum eo modo, quo recolit suum principium per hoc quod videt se non esse a se et hoc etiam modo non potest ignorare, Deum esse in ratione sui principii, alia est, cum movetur anima secundum partem inferiorem rationis, quae est ad contemplandas creaturas, et hoc modo potest ignorare, esse Deum, si per peccatum et errorem aversa a Deo obtenebratur eo modo, quo dicit Apostolus R. I. cum Deum cognovissent, non sicut Deum glorificaverunt, sed evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis, etc.

[2] Cognoscere Deum esse in aliquo communi sub quadam confusione est nobis naturaliter insertum.

[3] Dato etiam, quod quilibet intelligat, hoc nomine Deus significari id quod dicitur, scilicet illud, quo majus cogitari non potest, non tamen propter hoc sequitur, quod intelligat, id, quod significatur per nomen, esse in rerum natura, sed in apprehensione intellectus tantum.

[4] The great influence of this school has been noticed in the excellent work of Dr. Schmölders, already referred to, Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes, Paris, 1842.

work *De causis*, translated from the Arabic, and circulated under the name of Aristotle, — a work which was much studied and which acquired great authority over the minds of men in the thirteenth century.[1]

This production contains, throughout, the principles of the *neo*-Platonic monism, as the same was reduced to form and systematic coherence by Plotinus,— the doctrine of the absolute as the superexistent, from which issues forth the whole developing process of being, proceeding by regular gradations, the idea of creation transformed into the doctrine of a process of evolution grounded in immanent necessity.[2] Thomas Aquinas, who composed a commentary on this work, seeks to explain its propositions, which refused to accommodate themselves to his Christian theism, by presenting them under a mitigated form.[3] He himself did not escape wholly untouched by the influence of the ideas set forth in this tract; for, indeed, the rigid consistency of speculation conducted even him to a one-sided monism. While, then, this predominating tendency in the speculative theology of the thirteenth century was still held in check by the stronger force of the Christian principle,— and while with the majority, therefore, the Christian consciousness that governed the mode of thinking operated to prevent the full and logical evolution of these ideas, so that they must submit to be blended with a Christian theism with which they had but little affinity,— we cannot be surprised to find that there were individuals who felt impelled to express and evolve the same thoughts in a manner more consistent, and more directly at variance with the theism that governed the consciousness of their age. Such was the relation in which Almaric of Bena, and his disciple David of Dinanto, stood to the times in which they lived.[4]

[1] Jourdain, in the work already referred to: Recherches critiques, etc., p. 212, first directed attention to this source and to the great influence of this book in the thirteenth century; though he goes to an extreme in undervaluing the undeniable influence of Scotus. Albertus Magnus took pains to expound the doctrines of this book, in his Liber secundus de terminatione causarum primariarum, Tractatus i, in his opp. ed. Lugd. 1651, t. v, f. 563. He ascribes the book to a certain Jew, David, who had combined Aristotelian doctrines with those of the Arabian philosopher. Thomas Aquinas, who wrote a commentary on this book (in the edition of his works, Paris, 1660, t. iv, where may be found printed also the book itself), rightly perceived that the work contained *neo*-Platonic, rather than Aristotelian doctrines, and held it to be a translation of some writing of Proclus.

[2] Of the highest principle, it is said that it is called spirit, indeed, being the cause of spirit; but that in reality it is something far higher, and in general, nothing determinate could be predicated of it: Non cadunt super primam causam meditatio neque sensus neque intelligentia et ipsa quidem non signatur, nisi a causa secunda, quae est intelligentia, et non nominatur nisi per nomen causati sui primi, verumtamen per modum sublimiorem. Opp. Thomae, cit. t. iv, f. 481.

[3] The above-cited passage concerning the absolute he explains as relating to the infinitude of the divine being, as compared with all determinate limited modes of existence: Causa prima est supra ens, in quantum est ipsum esse infinitum, ens autem dicitur, quod finite participat esse, et hoc est proportionatum intellectui nostro.

[4] The same ideas lie, in truth, at the foundation of the system of Scotus, that are unfolded in the book, De causis, which book exercised a more general influence than the heretical Scotus could do. But that the work of Scotus also had a special influence on these two men, is evident from incontestable marks. Albertus Magnus in the first part of his Summa (Tract. iv, Quaest. 20. Membr. ii.) cites the book of David of Dinanto de tomis, hoc est de divisionibus, which makes mention of the work of Scotus, De divisione Naturae.

The former was so called from his birthplace in the diocese of Chartres. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, he taught at Paris. After gaining a high reputation by his lectures on dialectics, he passed over to theology, and now created a great sensation by many of the opinions he advanced; among which may be mentioned, in particular, the following: "As no man can be saved without believing in the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, so neither can he be saved without believing that he *himself* is a member of Christ." This, he maintained, was a necessary article of faith. Such an assertion might no doubt have been called forth by the reaction of the Christian mind, and particularly of the mystic element in it, against the churchly, theocratical point of view,— by a tendency that placed the immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ in opposition to its dependence on the church. Now we cannot fail to remark, it is true, in Almaric also, the antagonism of a subjectivity carried to excess against the objectivity of the church catholicism; but at bottom of it lies, not a theistic, but a pantheistic view of the world; and only in connection with this latter, can that which he meant be understood, in the sense in which he meant it. Taken in an isolated manner by itself, this proposition was susceptible of various interpretations; and, accordingly, when it was for the first time publicly advanced, it was only by virtue of the church instinct that men suspected the anti-Christian element in it, without understanding its true significance in the connection of that teacher's ideas. The Parisian university, in 1204, condemned the doctrines of Almaric, and expelled him from the professorial chair. He appealed to pope Innocent the Third, who confirmed, however, that decision. Upon this, he returned, in 1207, to Paris, and offered the recantation that had been prescribed to him; soon after which he died. It was not known, however, that he had left any school behind him. By his disciple, David of Dinanto, these doctrines were propagated, and carried to a still further length. David exerted an influence also by his writings, in which he expounded them.

We recognize here the principles of that monism, the sources of which have been pointed out; the doctrine of one being, lying at the ground of all, which being can be known only in its manifold forms of manifestation; — the whole universe only a manifestation of the divine essence. David of Dinanto[1] defined God as the *principium materiale omnium rerum.* He distinguished three principles; the first indivisible principle, matter, the *substratum* of the corporeal world; the first

Moreover, the propositions ascribed to Almaric, as they are cited by Martinus Polonus in his Supputationes to Marianus Scotus, hint at the same: Ideas, quae sunt in mente divina, creare et creari,— the doctrine that, as all things proceeded from God, so all will return back to him again; that God is known only in his Theophanies; that, without the first sin, the separation of sexes would not have taken place; that Christ, after his resurrection, belonged no longer to any particular sex. The historian who cites these dogmas, says himself, too; Qui omnes errores inveniuntur in libro, qui intitulatur peri physeon.

[1] Vide Albert. M. Summa theol. Pars. i, Tractat. iv. Quaest. 20. Membr. ii, ed. Lugd. t. xvii. f. 76, and Thomas Aquinas in Sentent. lib. ii, Distinct. 17. Quaest i, Artic. i, ed. Venet. t. x, p. 235.

indivisible out of which proceeds the soul; namely, spirit (*nus*); the first indivisible in the eternal substances (*ideas*) namely, God. Between these three, he affirmed, there can be no distinction; else we must suppose a still higher essence, from which all these three were derived, and of which they partake after different manners. No other supposition remains, then, than that these three are altogether identical, — different designations of the one divine essence, according to different relations of the same to the corporeal, the spiritual, and the ideal worlds.[1] Thomas Aquinas[2] makes a difference between the doctrine of Almaric and that of David of Dinanto. The school of the former, he said, considered God as the *principium formale* of all things; the second, taught that God is the *materia prima*. According to this latter doctrine, they might consider all nature as the body of God, — God as the one subject in all. Nothing else has any true being; all things else are mere accidents, under which God, to whom alone being is to be attributed, veils himself, — *accidentia sine subjecto*. The church doctrine of the Lord's supper they explained as a symbolical clothing of this truth. The consecrating priest, they supposed, did not here first produce the body of Christ, the body of God, but he only denoted that which, without any act of his, was already present, and brought it, by his words, to the consciousness of the community.[3] Taking this ground, they could say every true Christian must be conscious of the fact, that God has become man in him, even as he became man in Christ; and it is now evident, also, that the doctrine of Almaric which we first cited should be understood as taken in connection with these ideas. Although an abstract speculative system was not calculated, especially at this time, to spread among the laity, yet through the element of mysticism, which itself was hidden under a Christian guise, it was attempted, and that not without success, to diffuse these doctrines even among laymen. Books were composed for this purpose in the French language. Pantheism, with all the practical consequences that flow from it, was more boldly and abruptly expressed than perhaps the original founders of this school had intended. That distinction of the three ages which had attached itself to the doctrine of the Trinity, and which we noticed in the doctrines of the abbot Joachim, was employed by this sect also, after their own

[1] Albertus cites the argumentation in David of Dinanto as follows: Quaero, si nus et materia prima differunt an non? Si differunt, sub aliquo communi, a quo illa differentia egreditur, differunt et illud commune per differentias formabile est in utrumque. Quod autem unum formabile est in plures, materia est vel ad minus principium materiale. Si ergo dicatur una materia esse materiae primae et nois, aut differunt aut non. Si differunt, oportet, quod sub aliquo communi, a quo differentiae illae exeunt, differant, et sequitur ex hoc, quod illud commune genus sit ad illa. Ex hoc videtur relinqui, quod Deus et nois et materia prima idem sunt secundum id, quod sunt, quia quaecunque sunt et nulla differentia differunt, eadem sunt.

[2] Summa Pars i. Quaest. iii, artic. viii.

[3] From the Acta of a Parisian council of the year 1210, which have been published by Martene and Durand in the Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, t. iv, f. 163: Deus visibilibus erat indutus instrumentis, quibus videri poterat a creaturis et accidentibus corrumpi poterat extrinsecis. *Ante* verborum prolationem visibilibus panis accidentibus subesse corpus Christi. Id. quod ibi fuerat prius formis visibilibus, prolatione verborum subesse ostenditur.

peculiar manner. As the predominant revelation of God the Father, in the Old Testament, was followed by the revelation of the Son, by which the forms of worship under the legal dispensation were done away; so now the age of the Holy Ghost was at hand, — the incarnation of the Holy Ghost in entire humanity, the being of God under the form of the Holy Ghost after an equal measure in all the faithful; that is, the dependence of the religious consciousness upon any one individual as a person in whom God is incarnate, would cease, and the consciousness of all alike, that God exists in them, has in them assumed human nature, would come in place of it. The sacraments, under which the Son of God had been worshipped, would then be done away; religion would be made wholly independent of ceremonies, of everything positive. The members of this sect are the ones in whom the incarnation of the Holy Ghost has begun, the forerunners of the above-described period of the Holy Spirit. Several other opinions are charged upon members of this sect, which certainly accord with their general mode of thinking; as, for example, that God had spoken in Ovid as well as in Augustin;[1] that the only heaven and the only hell are in the present life; that those who possess the true knowledge no longer need faith or hope; they have attained already to the true resurrection, the true paradise, the real heaven;[2] that he who lives in mortal sin, has hell in himself, but it was much the same thing as having a rotten tooth in the mouth.[3] These people opposed the worship of saints as a species of idolatry. They called the ruling church Babylon; the pope, antichrist. It is said, also, that many of them were carried along by pantheistic mysticism, by the tendency to a one-sided inwardness, into a sort of ethical *adiaphorism*, which sanctioned the worst excesses. The maxim, that a man's condition depended, not so much on outward works as on inward disposition, on love; as on the fact of his being conscious of having God within him, is said to have been pushed by many even to such consequences as the above. William of Aria, a goldsmith, stood forth as a preacher among this sect. He announced the coming of judgments on a corrupt church, and the evolution of the new period of the Holy Ghost that was now near at hand. In the year 1210, this sect was discovered; several clergymen and laymen, who refused to recant, were burnt at the stake. Bernard a priest, carried his pantheistic delusion to such a length as to declare, that, so far as he had being, they could not burn him, for, so far as he existed, he was God himself. One of the pernicious consequences of such phenomena was, that men were led by occasion of them, to look upon every freer movement of the religious spirit with a more suspicious eye. With the writings of David of Dinanto, all theological works in the French language were burnt and forbidden.

[1] Caesar. Heisterbach, l. c. v, 22.

[2] In the report in Martene and Durand: Spiritus sanctus in iis incarnatus iis omnia revelabat, et haec revelatio nihil aliud erat quam mortuorum resurrectio. Inde semetipsos jam resuscitatos asserebant, fidem et spem ab eorum cordibus excludebant, se soli scientiae mentientes subjacere, — with which also agrees the report of Caesarius.

[3] The account given by Caesarius of Heisterbach.

This pantheistic monism was now attacked by the most distinguished scholastic theologians. Albertus Magnus maintained, in opposition to it, that God is not the material nor the essential but the causative being of all existence; and the causative as the efficient, formal, and final cause, the efficient, formative principle, and the end of all existence; the original type to which all existence must be traced, according to which everything has been formed, and which everything is appointed to represent; as in truth, the original type has an existence of itself, independent of the things that are formed after it, and in order to represent it.[1] Thomas Aquinas expresses himself after a similar manner: God is the *esse omnium effective et exemplariter*, but not *per essentiam*.

As we have an example here, showing that the foreign elements of the neo-Platonic monism, which the speculative theology of this century strove to blend into one whole with the Christian faith, would resist all such attempts, and prove rebellious to this faith itself,— so we have another example of a like incongruity in the ideas of the Aristotelian philosophy, adopted by this theology as absolute truths of reason, with which the truths of faith could not be at variance. There arose a view of the Aristotelian doctrines, growing out of the doctrines of the Arabian philosopher Averrhoës, which threatened to dissolve this league between philosophy and faith, and which, if consistently carried out, would also — like the doctrine of Almaric, that started from a neo-Platonic principle — necessarily pass over into a pantheistic mode of thinking. It was affirmed that the thinking reason is in all men identically the same, that there is but one intelligence in all. Those who set forth this as a doctrine of Aristotle, and — what in their opinion was the same thing — a doctrine that resulted with necessity from the fundamental position of bare rational knowledge or of philosophy, were well aware of the consequences — irreconcilable with the Christian faith and the doctrines of the church — which flowed from such an assertion, and represented themselves, at least, as being very far from adopting these consequences. But this subjection to the authority of faith, expressed in connection with this acknowledged opposition between reason and faith, was of such a nature as could not fail to awaken suspicions respecting the honesty of their professions, or at least respecting the seriousness and liveliness of their religious interest; as, for example, when one occupying this ground asserted: "By my reason, I conclude, with necessity, that mind is numerically but one, but, by my faith, I firmly maintain the contrary;"[2] when he expressed himself with regard to the Christian position, which was incapable of being reconciled with the above proposition, in the cold and indifferent way: "The Latins do not admit this, according to their principles, because, perhaps, *their law* stands in contradiction with it;" where Thomas Aquinas, who cites this language,[3] justly takes offence,

[1] Sicut paradigma, a quo fiunt, et ad quod formantur, et ad quod finiuntur, cum tamen intrinsecum sit extra facta formata et finita existens et nihil sit de esse eorum.

[2] Per rationem concludo de necessitate, quod intellectus est unus numero, firmiter tamen teneo oppositum per fidem.

[3] In his Opusc. ix, De unitate intellectus

that one who pretended to be a Christian, could thus speak of Christianity, as the law of a strange religion; could designate the doctrines of faith as *positiones catholicorum*. It is obvious to remark how mischievous would be the spread of a doctrine so hostile to the fundamental grounds of Christian conviction; how pernicious this disguised schism between subjective conviction and the doctrines of the church, this homage, altogether hypocritical, or at any rate not springing from the lively feeling of an inner necessity, to the authority of the church, must prove, when such views found currency, as they already began to do even among laymen.[1] These doctrines, then, Thomas Aquinas felt himself called upon to combat, not only in his general work concerning the whole body of the doctrines of faith,[2] but also in a small treatise, which he composed expressly on this subject. He was not satisfied with appealing to the consequences hostile to the Christian faith which must flow from such opinions,— to the fact, that thereby the doctrines of personal immortality, and of a final retribution, would be annihilated,— but while he strongly protested against that pretended opposition between the truths of faith and the truths of philosophy,[3] he endeavored to show, also, that this doctrine was contrary to reason and by no means a genuine doctrine of Aristotle.

The doctrine concerning the divine attributes gained rich accessions by the labors of these theologians. Several new investigations were evoked by Abelard. One of the charges brought against him was, that he had denied the essential omnipresence of God. Walter of Mauretania, mentioned on a former page, thought that he had heard an opinion of this sort uttered by Abelard himself.[4] Also, Hugo a St. Victore speaks[5] of certain sophists, who maintained that God was omnipresent only in virtue of his power, but not in virtue of his essence;[6] since otherwise, God would be affected by the impurity in the world. According to this statement, Abelard, like the Socinians in later times, supposed a being of God without the world,— in the sense of limitation,— so that this "without" should be understood as spatial, and, separating from one another the essence of God and his acts, reduced his omnipresence simply to the fact that God's agency extends to everything in the world. But if we consult Abelard's own explanations of the matter, we see plainly that he was very far from

contra Averroistas in vol. xix of the Venetian edition.

[1] See the Life of Thomas Aquinas, already referred to, c. iv. A knight, who was called upon to do penance for his crimes, gave for his reply, that if Peter obtained salvation, he also was sure of it, for there was but one and the same spirit in himself and in Peter.

[2] See in lib. ii. Sentent. Dist. 17. Quaest. ii, artic. i.

[3] He says, in opposition to that statement: Cum autem de necessitate concludi non possit nisi verum necessarium, cujus oppositum est falsum et impossibile, sequitur secundum ejus dictum, quod fides sit de falso et impossibili, quod etiam Deus facere non potest. Quod fidelium aures ferre non possunt.

[4] His words addressed to Abelard, in D'Archery, Spicilegia, t. iii, f. 525: Praeterea notificate mihi, si adhuc creditis, quod Deus essentialiter non sit in mundo vel alibi. Quod, *si bene memini* audivi vos fateri, quando novissime invicem contulimus de quibusdam sententiis. From which very words it is quite evident that he might easily have misunderstood Abelard.

[5] In his Summa Tractat. i, c. iv.

[6] Quidam calumniatores veritatis dicunt. Deum per potentiam et non per essentiam ubique esse.

entertaining any such views. What he says is this: "We cannot conceive of God's being present *anywhere* after a spatial manner, but we must understand his omnipresence as an omnipresent agency." He meant only to give prominence to this idea, that God is omnipresent in his agency without spatial presence or spatial change, without departing from that immutability of his essence which ever holds the like relation to space and time; — that space presents no limitation, has no existence for him.[1] But even this, which Abelard said concerning an active omnipresence of God,— directly for the purpose of excluding all spatial representations, gave occasion to the misconception, that he denied the essential omnipresence of God, and referred it simply to his agency, separated from his essence. In his *Introductio in Theologiam*,[2] he says: "As spirit generally is spatially present nowhere, and spatially moves itself in no direction, so this holds good preëminently of God, since he, by his essence, is everywhere present.[3] In accordance with this must those passages of sacred Scripture be understood, which speak of God as coming or descending; by which, is not meant a movement in space, but a new effect, proceeding from that agency of God, which is circumscribed by no space.[4] Thus, for example, when it is said that he comes to or departs from this or that individual, the reference is to the communication or withdrawal of his gifts."[5] In this way, too, he keeps clear of a misconception with regard to the incarnation of God, which arose from its being so sensuously apprehended: "When God is said to come upon the Virgin, this should be understood of some peculiar relation of God's all-pervading agency.[6] By his descent upon the Virgin, nothing else was denoted than that letting down of himself whereby he entered into union with human nature.[7] That God is essentially everywhere, is a proposition referring to his power or agency which is nowhere inactive, but manifests its action in all places.[8] As without God's preserving agency nothing could subsist even for a moment, so this very conception involves in it, that

[1] In the Apologetical Dialogue, concerning the relation of which to Abelard's authorship we have spoken above, and in which we, at any rate, find the correct exposition of his doctrines, it is said: Ipse, qui sic nunc quoque sine positione locali sicut ante tempora consistens, non tam in loco esse ducendus est, qui nullatenus localis est, quam in se cuncta concludere loca. Qui enim ante omnia sine loco exstitit, nec *sibi ipsius* modum (no limits for himself) sed *nobis loca* fabricavit. Per potentiam suam tam intra omnia quam extra; by which is denoted that this category of space, *inner* or *outer*, cannot be applied to God's being and action. L. c. p. 95, seqq.

[2] Lib. iii, p 1126.

[3] Ubique per substantiam, ubique essentialiter, semper substantiae praesentia in omnibus est locis.

[4] Non aliquis ejus localis accessus, sed aliquis novae operationis effectus ostenditur.

[5] Cum in quosdam venire vel a quibusdam recedere dicitur, juxta donorum suorum collationem vel subtractionem intelligitur id, non secundum localem ejus adventum vel recessum, qui ubique per praesentiam suae substantiae semper existens, non habet, quo moveri localiter possit.

[6] Cum itaque Deus in virginem venire dicitur, secundum aequam (perhaps aliquam) efficaciam, non secundum localem accessionem intelligi debet.

[7] Quid est enim aliud, cum in virginem descendisse, ut incarnaretur, nisi ut nostram assumeret infirmitatem, se humiliasse, ut haec quidem humiliatio ejus videlicet intelligatur descensus?

[8] Quod tamen ubique esse per substantiam dicitur, juxta ejus potentiam vel operationem dici arbitror, ac si videlicet diceretur, ita ei cuncta loca esse praesentia, ut in eis aliquid operari nunquam cesset, nec ejus potentia sit alicubi otiosa.

it is by the energy of his essence God exists and acts everywhere."[1] From these remarks, it is already quite evident that Abelard does not, by what he says concerning the divine omnipresence, as an active one, by any means exclude essential omnipresence; and he himself takes care to guard against any such interpretation, by adding: "It is common to say of a monarch, that he has a long arm, because he makes his power felt even in distant regions; he does so, however, not by his essence, but by means of his representatives."[2] Abelard thought he had hit upon an analogy by which we might form some right conception of the divine omnipresence, in the mode in which the soul is present in all parts of the body.[3] Thus, also, he expressed himself in his lectures, as we may see in his so-called Sentences:[4] "God is everywhere present by his essence, because he everywhere acts immediately by himself, without needing the instrumentality of others. For although a king may act, by his power, through the whole extent of his dominion, yet he is not everywhere by his essence; since he cannot act at once throughout his whole empire without employing ministers and servants." It deserves to be noticed, also, that Abelard applied the idea of omnipresence to time as well as to space.[5] Hugo a Sancto Victore defends the doctrine of an essential presence of God,[6] perhaps in opposition to Abelard's misunderstood explication.[7] He lays down the trilemma: Either God is nowhere according to his essence, or, he is in some place without being everywhere, or, he is everywhere. The first and second cannot be true; only the third supposition, therefore, remains: "Though we cannot perfectly comprehend," he says, "yet we must believe, without doubting, that God is, in essence, everywhere." According to Hugo's notions, moreover, the idea of the divine omnipresence is coincident with the truth that all things subsist in dependence on God's preserving agency.[8] The same connection of ideas was adopted by the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century: "God is everywhere present in space," says Thomas Aquinas,[9] "inasmuch as he communicates to all that is in space being, force, and activity."[10]

In treating the doctrine of the divine omnipotence, the schoolmen of the twelfth century met with similar difficulties to those with

[1] Nam et ipsa loca et quicquid est in eis, nisi per ipsum conserventur, manere non possunt, et per substantiam *in eis esse* dicitur, ubi per propriae virtutem substantiae aliquid nunquam operari cesset vel ea ipsa servando vel aliquid in iis per seipsum ministrando.

[2] Non tamen hoc per substantiam facere sufficiunt, quod per Vicarios agunt.

[3] Anima per operationem vegetandi ac sentiendi singulis membris tota insit, ut singula vegetet et in singulis sentiat.

[4] Cap. xix, p. 50.

[5] Omnis locus ei praesens, sic et omne tempus, in the place just quoted.

[6] L. c. Summa Tract. i, c. iv.

[7] As in Abelard's Sentences a passage of Augustin is quoted, and also Hugo declaims against such an appeal to words of Augustin, this may indicate that he actually directed his polemics against Abelard; perhaps against some of his expressions in his lectures, according to some of the copies circulated about.

[8] Nec sine eo potest aliquid subsistere etiam per momentum ex omnibus, quae fecit, quia omnia continet et penetrat et nullo continetur.

[9] Summa, p. i. Qu. viii, art. i et ii.

[10] Ut dans eis esse et virtutem et operationem, quod dat esse omnibus locatis, quae replent omnia loca.

the solution of which Origen had busied himself. Two different rocks were to be avoided: they must not, under the name of omnipotence, attribute to God an infinite arbitrary will; nor, in seeking to avoid this danger, represent the divine being as dependent on a natural necessity, or derogate anything from his absolute freedom. By the prudent precaution and pious modesty of the speculations by which he endeavors to guard against both these errors, Anselm especially distinguishes himself. He says: "The freedom and will of God we must, conformably to reason, so understand as to place nothing in him that is derogatory from his dignity. The true idea of freedom regards that only which is befitting and becoming the divine excellence.[1] When it is said, 'What God wills is good, and what he wills not is not good,' this is not to be so understood as if, supposing God should will anything that is bad, it would be good because he willed it; for it does not follow that, if God should lie, it would be right to lie; but rather, that a being who lied could not be God. As truly as God is God, it is impossible for us to conceive that he should will that which is bad.[2] An hypothetical proposition of this sort is much the same as if we should set together the two impossible things,—if water is dry, fire is water. When we talk, in the case of God, of a necessity to will that which is good, the expression is an improper one. What we denominate necessity, is nothing else than the immutability of his goodness, which he has from himself, which is not derived to him from some other quarter."[3] Thus he rebuts the objection that God, if he cannot do otherwise than will that which is good, deserves no thanks. It is not a natural necessity, but the immutability of his eternal, holy will, and therefore is he the more to be praised in all his goodness.[4]

But Abelard's speculations could not be confined within the limits which the pious spirit of Anselm prescribed to itself. He says first:[5] "We should be cautious not to admit into the idea of omnipotence, anything that is grounded in deficiencies and limitations of creaturely existence,"[6] and on this side, he falls in with Anselm. But he adds: "We may, in a certain sense, refer everything which it lies in man's power to do, to the divine omnipotence, in so far as in him we live, move, and have our being, and he works all in all.[7] For he employs

[1] In his Dialogue, cur Deus homo lib. i, c. xii: Libertatem et voluntatem Dei sic debemus rationabiliter intelligere, ut dignitati illius non videamur repugnare. Libertas enim non est nisi ad hoc, quod expedit aut quod decet.

[2] Non sequitur: si Deus vult mentiri, justum esse mentiri, sed potius Deum illum non esse.

[3] Quae necessitas non est aliud, quam immutabilitas honestatis ejus, quam a se ipso et non ab alio habet, et ideirco improprie dicitur necessitas.

[4] Lib. ii, c. x,: Recte asseritur ipse sibi dedisse justitiam et seipsum justum fecisse. Ideirco laudandus est de sua justitia, nec necessitate, sed libertate justus est, quia improprie dicitur necessitas, ubi nec coactio ulla est nec prohibitio. Quapropter quoniam Deus perfecte habet a se quicquid habet, ille maxime laudandus est de bonis, quae habet et servat, non ulla necessitate, sed propria et aeterna immutabilitate.

[5] Introductio, lib. iii, p. 1109.

[6] Alioquin e converso impotentiam diceremus potentiam et potentiam impotentiam.

[7] Non absurde tamen et de his omnibus, quae efficere possumus, Deum potentem praedicabimus et omnia, quae agimus, ejus potentiae tribuimus, in quo vivimus, movemur et sumus, et "qui omnia operatur in omnibus."

us as instruments to accomplish that which he wills; and it may, in a certain sense, be said, that *he* brings about that which he suffers us to bring about. But he goes still farther, and starts the question whether God could do more, other, and better than he has actually done; which he answers in the negative; though he acknowledges, indeed, how offensive this must appear to some.[1] The consideration seemed to him of irresistible weight, that God, who is the supreme reason, can do nothing except what is in conformity with reason; that what he does is always the best, and that by virtue of his goodness he can do no other than this.[2] He brings up objections to this statement, and then seeks to refute them. On this supposition, God's omnipotence would have narrower limits than man's ability; for man can do a great many things otherwise than he actually does. And he brings up the words of Christ, when he said: "If I prayed to my Father, he would send ten thousand angels." In reply to the first objection, he remarks: "That we can do many things that we ought not to do, is to be ascribed to our weakness rather than to our dignity. We should be better if we could not do that which is evil." In reply to the second objection, he says: "Most assuredly, God would have done this if Christ had prayed; but that Christ should request this is the very thing that was impossible, since it was contrary to his temper." And thus, generally, he meets these and the like objections by distinguishing an hypothetical and an absolute possibility and necessity. To those who said: If God could not act differently, we should be under no obligation of gratitude to him, he replies: "It was really to be denominated nothing else than a certain necessity of his essence or of his goodness, one with his will, and no constraint."[3] "Since his goodness is so great that it moves him of himself to all good acts, he ought therefore to be the more loved and honored on account of his own proper essence, because this goodness dwells not in him in an accidental, but in an essential and immediate way.[4] For should we be less thankful to a person who afforded us help in distress, if his love were so great that he could not do otherwise, but felt constrained by the force of his love to help us?" This explanation he repeated in his *Theologia Christiana*.[5] "God is ever and at all times so consumed, to express ourselves after the manner of men, by his inexpressible goodness, that what he wills, he wills necessarily; and what he does, he does necessarily; just as everything that is grounded in the essence of God, dwells in

[1] Licet haec nostra opinio paucos aut nullos habeat assentatores et plurimum a dictis sanctorum et aliquantulum a ratione dissentire videatur.

[2] Cum videlicet in singulis faciendis vel dimittendis rationabilem habeat causam, cur ab ipso fiant vel dimittantur nec ipse quicquam, quia summa ratio est, contra id quod rationi congruit, aut velle aut agere queat

[3] Hic enim quaedam naturae vel bonitatis ejus necessitas ab ejus voluntate non est separata nec coactio dicenda est, qua etiam nolens id facere cogatur.

[4] Cum ejus tanta sit bonitas atque optima voluntas, ut ad faciendum non invitum eum, sed spontaneum inclinet, tanto amplius ex propria natura diligendus est atque hinc glorificandus, quanto haec bonitas ejus non ei per accidens, sed substantialiter atque incommutabiliter inest.

[5] L. c. Martene et Durand thesaur. anecdotor. t. v, f. 1357.

it after an eternal and necessary manner."[1] The extreme timidity that filled the mind of Abelard, lest he should say something which might be hurtful to the religious interest, expresses itself in what he remarks, under his sense of the difficulties that pressed him: "But as it is our endeavor to preserve spotless the honor of God in all things, and to glorify him to the utmost of our ability, so let us trustfully invoke his assistance, that he who frees his chosen from their sins, would make me free from the confusion of words, and that, by his grace, he would deliver me from the snare of this or that expression, to the glory of his own name, so that we may not be found chargeable in his sight, either with falsehood or presumption towards him. For it is he who tries the heart and the reins, who regards, in all, the disposition of the heart rather than the outward action, and asks not what has been done, but with what intention it was done."[2] After the same manner, he touches upon this point in the published copies of his lectures.[3] He observes of those who urged similar reasons to the ones just cited, against these tenets, that they did not seem to him rightly to understand, either the wisdom of God, or the declarations of Scripture or of the church fathers. He then[4] notices the opinion of those who endeavored to solve the difficulty in the doctrine of omnipotence by saying that God could do this or that if he pleased. He objects to them, that they represented God anthropopathically, as if deliberating with himself before he came to a decision. Now as this doctrine of Abelard was also fairly attacked by his opponents, he was obliged to speak of it in his apology; where he declared that he held fast everything that was essential to him, and avoided that which had given offence to many. "I believe that God can do only what it is befitting him to do (which was acknowledged even by Anselm); and that he can do much that he will not do." This he might indeed have said, on his old grounds, provided the "can" were understood abstractly, concerning which he makes no further explanation here.[5]

Hugo a St. Victore controverted in both of his works the doctrine of Abelard, but without naming him. He declaims against those who affirmed that God was so bound by the measure and law of his own works, that he could do nothing other and nothing better than what he had done; those who set limits to God's infinite power. He describes them as men who had lost themselves in their own curious speculations,[6] men swollen with the conceit of their own knowledge;[7] and

[1] Ex ipsa sua et ineffabili bonitate adeo semper, ut humano more loquar, accensus, ut quae vult necessario velit et quae facit, necessario faciat. Non enim carere sua potest bona voluntate, quam habet, cum sit ei naturalis et coaeterna, non adventitia, sicut nostra est nobis, et omne, quod in natura est divinitatis, necessario ei atque omnibus modis inevitabiliter inest, utpote justitia, pietas, misericordia et quaecunque erga creaturas bona voluntas.

[2] Ne nos mendacii vel praesumptionis in eum ab ipso arguamur, qui probator cordis et renum magis in omnibus in intentionem attendit, quam actionem, nec quae fiant, sed quo animo fiant. T. v, f, 1358.

[3] Sententiae, ed. Rheinwald, c, xx.

[4] Page 55.

[5] Ea solummodo Deum posse facere credo, quae ipsum facere convenit, et multa facere potest, quae nunquam faciet.

[6] De sacrament. lib, i, c. xxii: Illi nostri scrutatores, qui defecerunt scrutantes scrutationes.

[7] Summa Tract. i, c. xxiv: Quosdam scientia inflatos.

yet Abelard would doubtless have taken up into his doctrine all that Hugo said on the other side, and appropriated it as a still further determination of that doctrine. He applies here, in speaking of the divine will, a distinction which afterwards acquired great importance in the doctrinal controversies; the distinction of will in itself, as the interior action of God, *voluntas* as *beneplacitum Dei;* and that which presents itself phenomenally, as an object of the divine will, *signum beneplaciti*.[1] Now, if we understand the divine will in the former sense, God can do nothing and will nothing except what he wills; for his will is identical with his being and power.[2] But if we speak of his will in the other sense, the case is altered. All that God has created can be better than it is, if God so wills. He can make what he has created into something better; which does not suppose that it was bad before, but that he raises what he had created good to a still higher degree of perfection; not that God, so far as he himself is concerned, ought to have done better, but that it may become better through his operation, while he himself remains immutably the same."[3] He agrees with Abelard and Anselm, in extending the idea of the divine omnipotence to everything that is a positive power, and therefore excluding only that which has its ground rather in a deficiency or limitation of the creature.[4] But it is a remark of Hugo's, important in its connection with the theistic principle, that, as time is not commensurate with God's eternity, nor space with God's immensity, so neither are the works of God commensurate with his omnipotence.[5]

The dogmatists of the thirteenth century, also, declared against Abelard's doctrine, though, at the same time, his name was not mentioned. Thomas Aquinas says: "As the power of God is one, not only with his essence but also with his wisdom, so it may be rightly said, that nothing is in God's power which is not grounded in the order of divine wisdom; for the divine wisdom embraces the whole extent of the divine power. Nevertheless, the order implanted in things by the divine wisdom is not commensurate with that wisdom itself, so that the latter is limited to that order. If the end for which things were made stood in a commensurate relation to those things, it might be said that wisdom is confined to a certain determinate order, that this determinate order must necessarily take place, in order that this determinate end of wisdom may be attained. But the divine goodness is an end standing in no relation of comparison with created things.[6] Hence it

[1] Sicut praeceptio et prohibitio signa sunt voluntatis divinae, ita et operatio et permissio. Summa Tract i, c. xiii. This distinction was employed already by Abelard, without his denoting it in this particular form, Introduct. in theol. opp. page 1111: Velle Deus duobus modis dicitur aut secundum providentiae suae ordinationem aut secundum consilii adhortationem.

[2] Si de ipsa Dei voluntate loquimur, quae est hoc quod ipse, nihil potest facere, nisi quod vult et nihil potest velle, nisi quod vult, idem est enim velle quod esse, et idem etiam velle quod posse.

[3] Non ut ipse quantum ad se melius faciat, sed ut, quod fecit, ipso identidem operante et in eodem perseverante melius fiat.

[4] Omnia potest Deus, quae posse potentia est.

[5] Sicut aeternitatem non aequat tempus, nec immensitatem locus, sic nec potentiam opus.

[6] Sed divina bonitas est finis, improportionabiliter excedens res creatas.

follows, that the divine goodness may manifest itself in manifold ways, in ways other than the actual ones; that it is not tied to this particular order of things; therefore we must hold absolutely, that God can do otherwise than he does." Thus he comes upon the distinction between the divine power, as it reveals itself in the order of the universe established by divine wisdom, and the divine power absolutely, which holds of everything that does not involve a contradiction, *potentia Dei ordinaria et absoluta*. We must admit he has by no means resolved all the difficulties brought up by Abelard; and the distinction he makes might be adopted and employed also by Abelard, in his own way.

In their attempts towards a rational mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity, the schoolmen of this period pursued the same method with Augustin, in making the analogy between the creaturely and the supreme Spirit, their starting-point. This matter was first profoundly investigated and set forth by Anselm. "We can know God," says he, "not from himself, but only after the analogy of his creatures. That will best subserve this knowledge, therefore, which presents the highest degree of resemblance to God. If everything, so far as it has being, is an image of the highest being, this must hold good in the most eminent degree of that which is highest in the whole creation; this is the rational spirit. The more, then, it endeavors to enter into itself, for the purpose of coming to the knowledge of its own essence, the more will it succeed in elevating itself to the knowledge of God.[1] Hence this spirit may rightly be denominated a mirror to itself, in which to contemplate the image of him whom it cannot, as yet, behold face to face." Thus Anselm starts from the analogy of human consciousness, in order to mount upwards to the idea of the Trinity. "As it belongs to the essence of the creaturely spirit to come to the knowledge of itself, and thus to produce an image of itself within itself, we must conceive the same to hold true, after the highest manner, of the divine Being. The supreme Wisdom knows himself after an eternal manner, which is nothing other than the eternal Word; his most perfect image, of the same essence with himself.[2] As, again, everything produced by human art existed first in the idea of the producing mind; as this idea remains even when the work is destroyed, and is itself, in this respect, one with the art of the producing mind; so it is not another, but the same Word, in whom God knows himself, and all the things that are created. This divine idea is the ground of the existence of the creatures in manifestation, and precedes them; it is unchangeable and remains, even if the changeable creature perishes. The creatures possess, in this divine Word, a higher being than in themselves, in manifestation; they are, in so far, one with the divine Word himself.[3] Now if our knowledge of things only receives into itself an image of the

[1] Quid igitur apertius, quam quia mens rationalis quanto studiosius ad se discendum intendit, tanto efficacius ad illius cognitionem ascendit? Monolog. c. lxvi.

[2] Hoc itaque modo quis neget, summam sapientiam, cum se dicendo intelligit, gignere consubstantialem sibi similitudinem suam, id est verbum suum?

[3] In seipsis sunt essentia mutabilis, secundum immutabilem rationem creata, in ipso vero sunt ipsa prima essentia et prima existendi veritas.

same, which is not adequate to that which they are essentially in themselves, it is evident that we are still less capable of comprehending that higher being of things, as they exist in the divine Word, which is represented in created being only as in an image, and that Word itself.[1] It is a relation with which nothing else can be compared, that what the supreme Mind and his eternal Word are in their essence, and in their relation to the creation, is complete by itself in each, and at the same time in both; and still, no plurality in the two arises therefrom. This community of being is incapable of being expressed by words.[2] The most suitable and befitting words by which to denote this relation, that one proceeds from the other and is yet perfectly equal to the same, are the term birth, the name Son. Here, alone, the fact is perfectly exemplified, that the act of producing requires the coöperation of nothing else, and that what is produced represents the image of the producer without any dissimilitude.[3] As self-knowledge presupposes the remembrance of one's self (the thought of one's self), so this memoria, from which is produced the Word, corresponds to the Father. As God knows himself, he loves himself; and as the love of God to himself presupposes in him the remembrance of himself and the knowl edge of himself, so this is denoted by the procession of the Holy Ghost from both. All three pass completely into each other, constituting the one supreme Essence." By means of this concatenation of ideas, Anselm defended the doctrine of the Western church concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son. Being present during the time of his banishment from England, in 1098, at the council of Bari in Apulia, where the differences between the two churches came up for discussion, he was called upon to defend the Western doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, against the Greeks; and, as his mode of stating the doctrine met with general approbation, he was commissioned by the pope to reduce it to writing.

In his doctrine of the Trinity, which drew upon him so many attacks, Abelard followed a similar method; only with a difference arising out of his different mode of contemplating the relation of faith to rational knowledge; which led him to consider that analogy as constituting proper evidence for a truth grounded in the essence of reason, although this truth might first be clearly brought up to consciousness by a supernatural revelation, which by others was represented as being only an analogy illustrating some truth communicated by supernatural revelation. He wished to show that the doctrine of the Trinity is a necessary idea of reason, without which God cannot be rightly known as the highest Good; and hence even the better class of the pagan philoso-

[1] Cum constat, quia omnis creata substantia tanto verius est in verbo, id est intelligentia creatoris, quam in scipsa, quanto verius existit creatrix quam creata essentia, quomodo comprehendat humana mens, cujusmodi sit illud dicere et illa scientia, quae sic longe superior et verior est creatis substantiis, si nostra scientia tam longe superatur ab illis, quantum earum similitudo distat ab earum essentia?

[2] Constat igitur, quia exprimi non potest, quid duo sint, summus spiritus et verbum ejus, quamvis quibusdam singulorum proprietatibus cogantur esse duo.

[3] Nam in rebus aliis, quas parentis prolisque certum est habitudinem habere, nulla sic gignitur, ut nulla admixta dissimilitudine omnimodam similitudinem parentis exhibeat, ut omnino nullius indigens sola per se ad gignendam prolem sufficiat

phers had arrived at this knowledge. He would make it out, that this doctrine only served to express, in an exhaustive manner, the idea of God as the supremely good; — God as the omnipotence of the Father, as the wisdom of the Son, as the love or goodness of the Holy Ghost; and what is said of the relation of the three persons to each other, corresponds to the relation of these three ideas to each other. "By the name Father is denoted that power of the divine majesty whereby God is able to bring to pass whatsoever he wills; the Word, or the Son, denotes that wisdom whereby he knows all things, and nothing remains hid from him; the Holy Ghost, the goodness or the love whereby he orders and directs all things to the best end.[1] It is because these three ideas contain the whole, that, in imploring the divine grace to accomplish anything by our means, we say, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, testifying, by our mention of the divine power, wisdom, and goodness, that everything which God does, is done in a glorious manner. As the eternal wisdom presupposes omnipotence, — is itself a certain power, — so this relation of the derived to the original is expressed by the idea of eternal generation. But there is no place for love except between two; and the symbol of procession is suited to denote the essence and action of love, which is a proceeding forth of one being to another. Love is an out-going from one's self, a communication of one's self to another; the will to enter into union, into society, with another."[2] In several places he says: "By the Holy Ghost is signified the goodness of God, whereby he dispenses life and blessing from himself; exerts his agency on his creatures."[3] Yet in a more recent passage, in the new revision of his Christian Theology,[4] he says: "The mutual love of Father and Son to each other is also denominated the Holy Ghost, and not barely God's love to his creatures; since otherwise the necessary existence of the Holy Ghost and of the Trinity would not seem so clearly evident; for as creatures have not a necessary existence, the love of God to them is not a necessary love; and so the Holy Ghost would not have a necessary existence.[5] But God is self-sufficient, unchangeable in all the goodness that belongs to his being."

[1] Sicut Dei patris vocabulo divinae majestas potentiae exprimitur specialiter, ita filii seu verbi appellatione sapientia Dei significatur, qua cuncta discernere valet, ut in nulla penitus decipi queat. At vero Spiritus sancti vocabulo ipsa ejus caritas, seu benignitas exprimitur, qua videlicet optime cuncta vult fieri seu disponi et eo modo singula provenire, quo melius possunt, aliis quoque bene utens et optime singula disponens et ad optimum finem quoque perducens. Introduct. lib. i, p. 985.

[2] Nemo ad semetipsum caritatem dicitur habere, sed dilectionem in alterum extendit, ut esse caritas possit. Procedere itaque Dei est sese ad aliquam rem per affectum caritatis quodammodo extendere. ut eam videlicet diligat ac ei per amorem se conjungat. Introduct. lib. ii. p. 1085.

[3] Maxime Deus, cum nullius indiget, erga ipsum benignitatis affectu commoveri non potest, ut sibi aliud ex benignitate impendat, sed erga creaturas tantum, quae divinae gratiae beneficiis indigent, non solum ut sint, sed ut bene sint. Quo itaque modo Deus a se ipso ad creaturas exire dicitur, per benignitatis affectum vel effectum, quem in creaturis habeat, dicatur L. c. p. 1086.

[4] Theologia christiana, lib. iv, f. 1340.

[5] Posset quippe esse, ut nulla creatura unquam esset, cum nulla ex necessitate sit, ac per hoc consequens videtur, ut jam nec affectus ipsius, quem videlicet erga creaturas habet, ex necessitate sit ac per hoc Spiritus ipse ex necessitate non sit, quem dicimus ipsum affectum Dei esse sive amorem.

As a visible illustration of the relation of the three persons to each other, he employs the comparison of a seal made of brass: "Here we have the brass material, lying at the foundation; the image of the king, engraven on the brass; the form, composed of both, the seal.[1] Or the impression on wax, where, in like manner, the material, the form, and that which is made up of both, may be distinguished."[2] He, like earlier writers,[3] thinks that the dispute with the Greeks might be brought to an end, if it should be said, the Holy Ghost proceeds, in the most original sense, from the Father as the unbegotten;[4] but he also proceeds from the Son, or through the Son, when he brings the divine ideas, received from wisdom, into actual realization. Richard a St. Victore also resorted to a comparison of the same sort with that of Abelard; though he did not lay so much stress upon it, as an *argument*, to show the necessity of the doctrine of the Trinity. He too says that although the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the same; yet, in many parts of Scripture, power seems to be ascribed particularly to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and goodness to the Holy Ghost.[5] And to a query of the abbot Bernard, who descried something in such declarations resembling what had been so offensive to him in Abelard, he replied as follows: "I will very cheerfully tell you my opinion—What power, what wisdom, what love or goodness is, we all know. From that, then, which is manifest and known to us, we are so constituted, if I mistake not, as to frame to ourselves a conception of that which transcends the measure of human capacity; for in these three attributes is expressed a certain image of the Trinity, and a mirror, as it were, is given us, whereby we may come, from the things that are made, to the knowledge of the invisible essence of God."[6] He too, like Abelard, finds the relation of the three persons to each other answering to the relation of these three conceptions to each other.[7]

Hugo a St. Victore, like Anselm, places God's image in the human spirit at the foundation: The spirit; the knowledge begotten by it out of itself, or wisdom; and the love proceeding from both, with which it embraces its wisdom.[8] But in God, these are no changeable affections,

[1] Ipsum aes materia, ex qua factum est, figura ipsa imaginis regiae forma ejus, ipsum sigillum, ex his duobus materiatum atque formatum, quibus videlicet convenientibus ipsum est compositum atque perfectum. Introduct. lib. ii, p. 1081.

[2] Theol. christ. lib. iv, f. 1317. L. c.

[3] See vol. iii, p. 554.

[4] Hoc fortasse modo si a solo patre procedere spiritum Graeci intelligant, eo scilicet quod ab ipso sit quasi a summo et non existente ab alio, nulla est sententiae controversia, sed verborum diversitas. Introduct. lib. ii, p. 1095.

[5] Quamvis una eademque sit potentia et bonitas patris et filii et spiritus sancti, secundum quendam tamen modum loquendi in quibusdam scripturae locis potentia patri, sapientia filio, benignitas spiritui sancto (quasi specialiter) videntur assignari. De statu interioris hominis, c. iii, f. 39.

[6] In his tract De tribus appropriatis personis in trinitate, f. 271: In his, quae manifesta et nobis nota sunt, erudimur (ni fallor) ad eorum notionem, quae humanae capacitatis modum excedunt. In his enim tribus forma quaedam et imago summae trinitatis exprimitur et quoddam nobis velut speculum proponitur, ut invisibilia Dei per ea, quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciantur.

[7] In hac itaque rerum trinitate sola potentia non est de reliquarum aliqua, sapientia autem est de potentia sola, bonitas vero de potentia simul et sapientia.

[8] Quoniam ex se ipsa nascitur sapientia quae est in ipso, et quoniam ipsa diligit sa-

as in man. Each is one with its essence; this *higher* relation is denoted by the Trinity."[1] Richard a St. Victore endeavors to prove that the relation of the three persons to each other is a necessary relation, thus: "The Supreme Being must have an object worthy of his love, which he loves as himself. Hence the conception of the Father as the eternal cause of his equal Son. The latter having all things in common with the former, must have omnipotence also; accordingly, the third person must derive his existence from both."[2] Alanus says briefly, adopting the language of Hermes Trismegistus: "Unity begets unity, and reflects its own ardor (love) back upon itself; thus the procession of the Holy Ghost from both, is denoted as having its causative ground in the Father."[3]

Unedifying were the disputes which grew out of the improper transfer of opposite theories respecting universal conceptions to the doctrine of the Trinity. While Roscelin exposed himself to be called a tritheist by his nominalism, Gilbert of Poictiers, like John Philoponus, in earlier times,[4] drew upon himself the same reproach by taking the contrary position of the Aristotelian realism. The obscure, confused, and abstruse style in which this Gilbert wrote, served to prolong the dispute, while the parties could never come to an understanding with each other. His purpose was to avoid Sabellianism; to which, as he supposed, the comparisons just cited, with which it was attempted to prove or to illustrate the doctrine of the Trinity, might easily lead, if great care were not taken to keep separate things related and things different.[5] This

pientiam suam et ita procedit sapientia de mente et de mente et sapientia procedit amor, quo ipsa mens diligit sapientiam genitam a se.

[1] Quod ideo non sunt personae, quia sunt affectiones mutabiles circa animam. Aliquando enim anima est sine notitia et amore, nec potest dici notitia hominis esse homo, vel amor hominis est homo, sed sapientia Dei Deus est, amor Dei Deus est, quia non est in Deo aliud ab ipso. Summa sent. Tract. i, c. vi, De sacramentis, lib. i, p. iii, c. xxiii.

[2] Oportet condignum habere, ut sit, quem possit et merito debeat ut seipsum diligere. Si igitur primordialem personam veraciter constat esse summe bonam, nolle omnino non poterit, quod summa caritas exigit. Et si veraciter eam omnipotentem esse, quicquid esse voluerit, non poterit non esse. Exigente itaque caritate condignum habere volet et exigente potestate habebit quem habere placet. Ecce quod perfectio personae unius est causa existentiae alterius. And then: Si igitur idem posse est absque dubio ambobus commune, consequens est, tertiam in trinitate personam ex ambobus et esse accepisse et existentiam habere. In his work De trinitate, lib. v, c. vii et viii.

[3] Monas gignit monadem et in se suum reflectit ardorem. — Iste ardor ita procedit a monade id est a patre, quod ipsum non deserit, quia ejusdem est essentiae cum ipso vel in se alterum (his second self, the other altogether coequal to him) id est in filium suum reflectit ardorem, id est spiritum sanctum, sed ita procedit a patre, quod ejus auctoritate procedit a filio. See the Regulae theologicae, p. 180, seqq. Ed. Mingarelli.

[4] In despite of all Dr. Baur may have said, in his Geschichte der Dreieinigkeitslehre, ii, p. 510, where he rightly finds fault with an inaccurate expression in my St. Bernard, this comparison is an altogether correct one.

[5] Errant aliqui in comparationibus, imo ex comparationibus, cum aut si quid in iis est dissimile, illas omnino abjiciendas existimant, aut in his, propter quae non sit illarum inductio, easdem usurpant, ut Sabelliani. Qui cum audiunt unius substantiae tres esse personas, et propter eam, quae ex illarum proprietatibus est, diversitatem aut aequalitatem aut comparationem aut coaeternitatem aut processionem ostendendam, inductas similitudines legunt, scilicet vel unius animae mentem, notitiam, amorem vel unius mentis memoriam, intelligentiam, voluntatem vel unius radii splendorem et calorem vel hujusmodi alias, putant, quod sicut unus solus est radius, de quo dicuntur calor et splendor aut una sola est mens, de qua et memoria et intelligentia et voluntas aut una sola anima, de qua et mens et notitia et amor, ita quoque unus solus subsistens sit, qui cum sit natura Deus, idem

danger he would avoid by distinguishing the different senses, in which the name God is used; inasmuch as we understand by it either the one divine essence, the *substantia, qua est Deus;* the one substantial ground which is contained in the three persons; just as the one essence of the kind is contained in the individuals belonging to this kind;[1] the *forma constitutiva in rebus;* or, on the other hand, the persons distinguished one from the other by their personal properties, of which persons, each by itself is called God, the *substantia, quae est Deus.*[2] Yet Gilbert himself acknowledged the inadequacy of this transfer of creaturely relations to God, and expressed himself on this point to the effect, that the conception of one common substance could not be applied to the simple essence of God in the same sense as it is applied to composite beings.[3] Happily these disputes, which occupied men's minds more than the object deserved,[4] had no further influence on the determination of the doctrine of the Trinity. A confession of faith, which the abbot Bernard opposed to the doctrine of Gilbert, could not force its way into general recognition. Abelard declared, that the being of God cannot come under the categories;[5] and Peter Lombard, that the determinations of the church were designed rather to exclude from the simplicity of the divine essence what was not in it than to place anything therein.[6]

The theologians of the thirteenth century followed out the ideas which had already been advanced on this doctrine in the preceding age.

Alexander of Hales says: "To the essence of the Supreme Good belongs that highest communication of himself which is denoted by the generation of the Son. As the fullest communication of nature stands

ipse personalibus proprietatibus sit pater et filius et spiritus sanctus. See the Commentary on Boëth. f. 1150, already cited on page 409.

[1] The εἶδος is contradistinguished from the individual being, from the ὕλη, forma et materia. See the above-cited Commentary, f. 1140.

[2] He says, concerning the Sabellians: Quos hic ipse error patenter ostendit omnino nescire hujus nominis, quod est substantia, multiplicem in naturalibus usum, videlicet non modo id, quod est, verum etiam id, quo est, hoc nomine nuncupari. — Eorum qui sunt Deus, numeratio facta est, ejus vero, quo sunt Deus repetitio. In the above-cited Commentary, f. 1150, seqq.

[3] Ex aliqua rationis proportione transumptum sermonem rem ipsam, sicut est, minime posse explicare et praeter rationis plenitudinem sensum mentis in eo, quod non nisi ex parte concipi potest, laborare. L. c. f. 1164.

[4] It marks the character of these times that, as we have already noticed on page 359, a reputed soothsayer was consulted about the controversy between the Nominalists and Realists; and a Parisian magister sought, in the revelations of Hildegard, a decision of the contested points handled by Gilbert. And the latter declared, appealing to the revelations imparted to her, that, in speaking of God, essence and properties cannot be separated. Everything that is declared of God denote himself, in his essence: Quia homo hanc potestatem non habet, ut de Deo dicat, sicut de humanitate hominis et sicut de colore facti operis de manu hominis. Deus plenus est et integer et ideo non potest dividi sermone, sicut homo dividi potest. See the Correspondence of Hildegard, which has been published by Martene and Durand, in the Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum collectio amplissima, t. ii, f. 1098. ep. 66.

[5] Patet a tractatu philosophorum rerum omnium naturas in decem praedicamenta distribuentium illam summam majestatem esse exclusam omnino nec ullo modo regulas aut traditiones eorum ad illam summam atque ineffabilem celsitudinem conscendere. Introduct. ad theol. lib. ii, p. 1073.

[6] Magis videtur horum verborum usus introductus ratione removendi atque excludendi a simplicitate deitatis, quae ibi non sunt, quam ponendi aliqua. Lib. ii, Dist. 24

in generation, so the most perfect communication of will stands in love: we must therefore attribute both kinds of self-communication to the Supreme Good."[1] Albert the Great unfolds the matter thus: "Spirit can produce only by first sketching the idea of its work within itself, an offspring of spirit exactly answering to the work.[2] Next, is required an instrumentality, analogous to the essence of spirit, for the realization of the idea thus sketched forth. An idea of this sort must be simple, and of like essence with the highest acting principle, when this is so simple, that in it being, essence, and activity are all one.[3] The way in which God reveals himself in time, to make his rational creatures holy, and unite them to himself, necessarily presupposes that eternal act of the self-communication of God, by virtue of which the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son. Through the Holy Ghost one love is diffused through all holy souls; this is the prototype of all creaturely love, that from which all creaturely love is derived.[4] In itself, this is something immutable; neither increasing nor diminishing. We are the ones that increase or diminish as we become more or less assimilated to this supreme love in disposition, feeling, and action."[5] Thomas Aquinas also pursues the same analogy, with a view to prepare the way for understanding the doctrine of the Trinity, and he traces it out, as we shall see, in a profound manner; but he is careful at the same time to guard against the supposition as if the Trinity could thus be really demonstrated. "Only when we assume this doctrine as given, do such arguments have any significance."[6] He endeavors to show how this is so in particular cases.[7] But what Thomas Aquinas thinks that he is able to make out, is this, — that if the doctrine of the Trinity which is not to be proved *a priori*, is assumed by us as a doctrine of revelation, then the whole creation, and above all, the nature and essence of man's spirit bear witness in favor of it. "The perfect way in which the Son and the Holy Ghost derive their essence from the Father,[8] is the primal ground and cause of the procession of the creatures from God. As the origin of the

[1] Est igitur in summo bono diffusio generationis, quam consequitur differentia gignentis et geniti, patris et filii et erit ibi diffusio per modum dilectionis, quam dicimus processionem spiritus sancti.

[2] Format ex se rationem operis et speciem, quae est sicut proles ipsius intellectus, intellectui agenti similis in quantum agens est.

[3] Formans, formatum, spiritus rector formae.

[4] Una caritas diffusa per omnes animas sanctas per spiritum sanctum, ad quam sicut exemplar omnis dilectio refertur et comparatione illius et assimilatione caritas dici meretur, the primum formale omnis dilectionis.

[5] Quanto plus vel minus per assimilationem habitu et affectu et actu appropinquamus.

[6] Trinitate posita congruunt hujusmodi rationes.

[7] E. g. The infinite goodness of God reveals itself in creation. It by no means follows from this, that anything infinite proceeds from God, but it is enough, that each in its own measure participates of the divine goodness. Moreover, the argument that without society there is no blessedness, does not admit of being applied to a Being in himself all-sufficient. While the words ascribed to Hermes Trismegist: monas monadem genuit et in se suum reflexit ardorem, were by many applied to the Trinity, he, on the contrary, thinks that these words found their fulfillment in the work of creation; nam unus Deus produxit unum mundum propter sui ipsius amorem.

[8] The processio personarum, quae perfecta est

creation represents the perfection of the divine being only after an imperfect manner, so we are led back by it to the perfect type which completely includes in it all the divine perfections, namely, the Son, as the original type and pattern of the way in which creatures have their existence from God. And as all creatures owe their existence to the free goodness of the divine will, so this leads us back to *one* principle, constituting the ground of every free communication of God.[1] This is love; the *procedere per modum amoris* in the person of the Holy Ghost; the primal form of all communication of divine love. The *processio* is, in this case, not an act passing without the divine essence, and giving birth to something different from God, but one which abides within the agent himself. The more perfect this act of spiritual procession, the more completely one and identical is that which proceeds forth with that from which it proceeds forth.[2] Such acts of the spirit are knowing and willing, or loving (*intelligere* and *velle*). The more perfect the act of knowledge, the more completely is that which is known one with that which knows: the more perfect the love, the more completely the object of love becomes one with that which loves.[3] It is true, that *voluntas* and *intellectus* are in God one and the same: but in the order of conception, love, that comes from the will, certainly presupposes something received into the intellect, in order that it may be the object of love.[4] Hence, the procession of the Holy Ghost presupposes the generation of the Logos." He now seeks to show, from the same analogy, why it is that the idea of generation is applied more particularly to the Logos, and that of procession to the Holy Ghost. "The act of intelligence (*intelligere*) supposes an image of the object known, therefore corresponding to God's knowledge of himself is the generation of his Son as his perfect image. Love, on the other hand, denotes an inclination of the spirit towards another.[5] The Holy Ghost is the mutual love between the Father and the Son; therefore, the procession from both corresponds to the being of the Holy Ghost. As the Father expresses (*knows*) within himself the essence of all the creatures through the begotten Word, inasmuch as the begotten Word represents the Father and all the creatures after a perfect manner, so he *loves* himself and all the creatures in the Holy Ghost." Thomas declares that a knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity is necessary in order to a right understanding of the doctrine of

[1] Quod sit quasi ratio totius liberalis collationis.

[2] Id quod procedit ad intra processu intelligibili, non oportet esse diversum; imo quanto perfectius procedit, tanto magis est unum cum eo, a quo procedit.

[3] Manifestum est, quod quanto aliquid intelligitur, tanto conceptio intellectualis est magis intima intelligenti et magis unum, nam intellectus secundum hoc quod actu intelligit, secundum hoc fit unum cum intellecto. — Secundum operationem voluntatis invenitur in nobis quaedam alia processio, scilicet processio amoris, secundum quam amatum est in amante, sicut per conceptionem verbi res dicta vel intellecta est in intelligente.

[4] Non enim est processio amoris nisi in ordine ad processionem verbi, nihil enim potest voluntate amari, nisi sit in intellectu conceptum.

[5] Haec est differentia inter intellectum et voluntatem, quod intellectus sit in actu secundum suam similitudinem, voluntas autem sit in actu, non per hoc, quod aliqua similitudo voliti sit in voluntate, sed ex hoc, quod voluntas habet quandam inclinationem in rem volitam, as he afterwards says, secundum rationem impellentis et moventis in aliquid.

creation. "When it is taught that God created all things by his Word, this doctrine excludes the error of those who suppose that God produced all things by a natural necessity. By the doctrine of the procession of love, it is shown that God produced the creatures not because he needed to do so, nor for any other reason urging him from without, but from love to his own goodness. But especially is this doctrine necessary in order to right views respecting the salvation of mankind; since this has been brought about by the incarnate Son, and by the gift of the Holy Ghost."

With this theory correspond also the views expressed by Raymund Lull. The divine principle of all existence, he finds in the Father; the instrumental cause, in the Son; the end, where all things find their rest, he designates as the Holy Ghost.[1] "Because in the Holy Ghost all things find their end and their rest, he begets no other person. The Father and Son have respect through love to one end, and the same is the Holy Ghost.[2] All that God knows *within* himself (in contradistinction from his knowledge of things placed without himself) is God. In so far as love within God's essence terminates in a product, it is a person; in so far as it is not anything produced, it is his own essence. In so far as the Father knows himself as Father, he begets the Son. Because the Father and Son through love contemplate each other, they beget the Holy Ghost. The divine productivity begins with the Father and terminates in the Holy Ghost."[3] "The distinction of the divine persons," says he, "leads us to perceive that the divine perfections are not inactive by reason of their infinite fulness.[4] Because God is quite as much God by acting as by being, he has, by his own essence, different persons. No existence is possible without distinction."[5] Like Abelard, he considered the Trinity as an exhaustive designation of the most perfect essence.[6] In his disputes with the Mohammedans, he frequently employed the following argument: "Without the doctrine of the Trinity, we should be driven to suppose an eternal creation; otherwise, we must detract from the idea of God's perfection. The goodness of God cannot be conceived as inoperative.

[1] Quaelibet divinarum rationum est principium per patrem in filio et per filium est medium et per spiritum sanctum est quies et finis.

[2] Quaelibet divinarum rationum est principium per patrem in filio et per filium est medium et per spiritum sanctum est quies et finis. Id, propter quod spiritus sanctus non producit personam, est, ut appetitus cujuslibet rationis in illo habeat finem et quietem. Quia pater et filius per amorem se habent ad unum finem, ille finis est spiritus sanctus. See the section concerning the Son of God, in the liber proverbiorum.

[3] What he here says of the divine productivity, he expresses also in his proverbiis, in the following enigmatical style: Deus, in quantum intelligit, se posse Deum, producit Deum et in quantum intelligit se esse Deum, non producit Deum. Quia pater et filius intelligunt, quod possint Deum, producunt Deum.

[4] Distinctio divinarum personarum est, ut divinae rationes non sint otiosae de infinitate.

[5] Quia Deus est tantum Deus per agere, quantum per existere, habet in sua essentia distinctas personas. Nulla substantia potest esse sine distinctione, sine distinctione non esset quidquam.

[6] Tua perfectio laudetur et benedicatur, quae demonstratur in te ratione tuae sanctae trinitatis, quia ratione personae patris intelligimus tuam potestatem esse perfectam, et ratione personae filii intelligimus tuam sapientiam esse perfectam et ratione personae spiritus sancti intelligimus tuum benignum amorem esse plenum omni perfectione. Liber contemplationis in Deum, vol. i, lib. ii, Distinct. 22, c. c, t. ix, f. 219.

But without the doctrine of the Trinity we should be compelled to represent it to ourselves as being so until the creation. To the very essence of the highest goodness belongs self-communication. This can be conceived as a perfect act only in the doctrine of the Trinity."

Thomas Aquinas acknowledges, that a beginning of creation is simply a matter of faith; that such a beginning cannot be proved by arguments; the hypothesis of an eternal creation cannot be refuted. Thereby the causality of God in relation to the world is by no means denied: since we must conceive of God's act of creation as out of time, as an act not in succession. And if it be conceived as always existing, the world is not made eternal, in the same sense as God is, because the divine being excludes all succession.[1]

The teleological point of view led the schoolmen to investigate the question respecting the end of the creation. Bonaventura starts the inquiry, whether the glory of God, or the good of the creature, is to be considered as this ultimate end; which question came to the knowledge of the schoolmen in its connection with the inquiry respecting the supreme good, and that in its connection with and bearing on the system of morals. Bonaventura, after having stated the reasons on both sides, determines in favor of the former. "The highest end is God's glory; for God creates all things for his own sake; not to obtain glory for himself,— which would be inconsistent with his all-sufficiency, — or to augment that glory, but in order to display and to communicate it; and in the manifestation of God's glory, and a participation in it, consists the highest good of his creatures. Although in creatures it would be selfish to seek their own glory, yet it is otherwise with God; for here there can be no difference between the particular and the universal good. He is himself the highest good. If he had not respect therefore, in all he does, to himself, what he does would not be good."

The shaping of the theology of which we are now endeavoring to give an account, certainly proceeded from an age of predominating supernaturalism, when the latter occupied and pervaded the whole spiritual atmosphere. The idea of the miracle, therefore, exercised a vast power on the minds of theologians. Since it was the fact, however, as we have shown by many examples, that the prevailing view of the miracle was not an isolating, fleshly-Jewish view of the matter, but the genuinely Christian mode of taking the miracle in connection with everything else belonging to the evolution of the divine life, so that the latter was considered the end and centre of all;[2] therefore these theologians felt constrained to define the miracle, not according to the dead, mechanical view of God's relation to the world, but according to their own view of that relation, — a view which was animated, no less by a lively religious than by a profoundly speculative spirit. They must seek to point out the congruity of such an idea

[1] Quia esse divinum est esse totum simul absque successione. S. Theol. p. i, Qu 46, art. ii.

[2] See before, p. 312.

with their view of the creation, as a timeless act of God, with the active omnipresence of God, with a divine plan of the universe, binding together everything in organical coherence. Let us consider all this more in detail.

Abelard regarded the whole course of the world as a realization of the ideal order of the universe planned by the divine reason. By the one day, in the history of the creation, he understands: "That whole activity of God, by virtue of which he planned in his own mind the entire circle of existence, realized in the work of the six days."[1] In the phenomenal world is manifested, what was present in the divine idea; the work and the idea correspond exactly together.[2] It is this system of the ideal order of the world which is meant, when the Word of God is spoken of in which he created all things. It is evident from this, that there is nothing accidental, sudden, isolated; nothing that is not in conformity with reason.[3] Hence, the Platonic distinction between a *mundus intelligibilis* (κοσμος νοητός) and a *mundus sensibilis* (κοσμος αἰσθητός) seems to him to be according to truth. "If we look at this system only, which is grounded in the divine plan of the universe, there are no exceptions; everything belongs to it in like manner, as internal parts: in this regard, there is no difference between natural and supernatural." He considers, it is true, everything that takes place, as in like manner a work of God's omnipotence, as we might infer from his conception of that attribute above explained. And for this very reason, he must say, that in relation to the divine omnipotence, abstractly considered, nothing is a miracle:[4] but he distinguishes, in *the effects of* God's omnipotence, those which correspond to the powers and laws originally placed in the creation, whereby the latter are only called into activity, and those, to which those powers and laws would be inadequate, which evidence new powers introduced by God into the creation. This is what is meant when things are said to take place contrary to the "course of nature;" that is, the ordinary course of nature. This is what is meant by the supernatural.[5] Concerning such effects as these last, he says, that God thereby puts to shame the rules of the philosophers, because they are facts which the original laws of creation are inadequate to account for.[6] "When," says Abelard, "we examine into the powers of nature, or natural causes, we by no means look at that original act of God that formed

[1] Diem unum vocat totam illorum operum Dei consummationem, prius in mente habitam et in opere postmodum sexta die completam. Expositio in Hexaëmeron. l. c. Martene et Durand, t. v, f. 1372.

[2] Quasi enim de sinu quodam secreti sui singula Deus producit, dum exhibet opere quod antea conceperat mente nec a conceptu dissidet opus, dum quod mente disponitur, opere completur.

[3] Cuncta Deum condidisse in verbo, hoc est in sapientia sua ostenditur, id est nihil subito, vel temere, sed omnia rationabiliter ac provide. L. c. f. 1369.

[4] Excellentia divinae potentiae, quam constat ex propria natura quicquid decrevit posse.

[5] Contra naturam vel praeter naturam fieri, eo quod primordialium causarum institutio ad hoc minime sufficere posset, nisi Deus praeter solitum propria voluntate vim quandam rebus impertiret, ut hoc inde fieri posset. Theol. christian. lib. iii, f. 1133

[6] Deus philosophorum regulas in factis suis frequenter cassat, cum videlicet aliqua nova contra naturam facit sive supra naturam, hoc est supra hæc, quod prima institutio rerum potest. L. c. lib. ii, f. 1074

the plan of the universe, where the agency of nature is to be considered identical with the will of God: but we have regard in this case solely to the work of the six days, the groundwork of the constitution of the world as then given.[1] We speak of that original constitution of nature which was so arranged as to bring to pass all things out of itself, without a miracle."[2] He compares miracles, considered as effects of a new power introduced by God into the system of nature, with the original creative act of God, which first called the universe into being, when his will alone held the place of nature in all that he did.[3] By thus distinguishing from one another the ideal, divine constitution of the world, embracing at once natural and supernatural, and the ordinary course of nature corresponding to the powers and laws originally planted by God in nature, Abelard confuted that presumption of worldly wisdom, which, referring all phenomena to one law, denied the possibility of miracles. "When philosophers," says he, "call an event that takes place by miracle an impossibility, or a thing contrary to the course of nature, — as, for instance, the birth from a virgin, the seeing of the blind, — they really have regard to the ordinary course of nature, or original natural causes;[4] not to the sublimity of the divine power, which is able to bring to pass all that it has determined, and to change the very nature of things, so as to bring to pass uncommon events as it pleases.[5] The mistake of these philosophers is that they confine their views to the nature of things created, and to every day experience, and pay no regard, or scarcely any, to the divine omnipotence, which controls all nature, and whose will nature, properly so called, obeys.[6] When they call a thing, therefore, possible or impossible, conformable or contrary to nature, they do not measure that thing by the standard of the divine omnipotence."

It is plain from what has been said, that Abelard himself, in rejecting, as we have before related, the miraculous stories of his own times, did so by no means on the ground of philosophical principles, hostile to the reception of miracles. Nor was it his opinion that miracles must necessarily be confined to a certain limited period in the history of the church. On the contrary, he declared against those who said that miracles had ceased, because the church no longer needed them for the

[1] Nullatenus nos modo, cum in aliquibus rerum effectis vim naturae vel causas naturales requirimus, id nos facere secundum illam priorem Dei operationem in constitutione mundi, ubi sola Dei voluntas naturae efficaciam habuit in illis tunc creandis vel disponendis, sed tantum ab illa operatione sex diebus completa. Exposition in Hexaëm. L. c. Martene et Durand, t. v. f. 1378.

[2] Deinceps vim naturae pensare solemus, tunc videlicet rebus ipsis jam ita praeparatis, ut ad quaelibet sine miraculis facienda illa eorum constituti vel praeparatio sufficeret.

[3] Unde illa, quae per miracula fiunt, magis contra vel supra naturam, quam secundum naturam fieri fatemur, cum ad illud scilicet faciendum nequaquam illo rerum praeparatio prior sufficere possit, nisi quandam vim novam rebus ipsis Deus conferret, sicut et in illis sex diebus faciebat, ubi sola ejus voluntas vim naturae obtinebat in singulis efficiendis.

[4] Ad usitatum naturae cursum vel ad primordiales rerum causas respiciunt. Introduct. ad theol. lib. iii, p. 1153.

[5] Quam videlicet constat ex propria natura quicquid decrevit posse et praeter solitum ipsas rerum naturas quocunque voluerit modo permutare.

[6] Omnes eorum regulas infra eam vel extra eam penitus consistere.

conversion of unbelievers. "As faith without works is dead," said he, "miracles no doubt are needed, together with other means for the quickening of faith. And even if we stop with the conversion of unbelievers, as the end of miracles, there is no lack, even now, of heretics, pagans, and Jews." He ascribed the cessation of miracles to the fault of his contemporaries. It was because so very few were to be found who were worthy of such a grace; because every man desired it, not for the saving good of others, but for the gratification of his own vanity. To such extent had that faith disappeared, of which our Saviour spake, when he said, "If ye had faith like a grain of mustard-seed."

Though Abelard was attacked on many sides from the supernaturalistic position held by the majority in his times, still, the endeavor to find a point of conciliation between the supernatural and the natural, was common to all the great teachers of the thirteenth century. They supposed, with Abelard, things relatively rather than absolutely supernatural. To distinguish in what sense a thing might be conceived to take place, *contra* or *supra naturam*, and in what sense not, — all depended, in their opinion, upon rightly distinguishing the different conceptions of nature itself. Thus Alexander of Hales distinguishes nature, as self-active, and as passive, receptive (the *potentia activa* and *susceptiva*, the *possibilitas activa* and *passiva*), nature as the material lying at the ground of all things, and nature considered as the form of manifestations. "As it concerns the former, nature is so constituted by the Creator of nature — who embraces all things in his plan of creation, whose works all cohere together — as to produce whatsoever can in any way be formed out of her or be wrought in her, whether it be in the ordinary course of nature, or by miracles. She is so constituted, that the divine will, which all things must subserve, is accomplished in her; and in this respect, there is nothing contrary to the course of nature, nothing supernatural.[1] But miracles are effects which suppose a new creative inworking of God. to the accomplishing of which the self-activity of nature is inadequate; and so in this respect, as transcending nature, they are to be denominated supernatural, and things at variance with the form in which the self-activity of nature exhibits itself. The miracle, as a new form struck upon nature, is *contra naturam* (*praeter* or *supra naturam* as *potentia activa*, *potentia ad actum; contra naturam*, *quae dicitur forma*)." Accordingly, in reference to the *potentia obedientialis* or *passiva* in nature, he could say of the miracle, that the constitution for it, is one hidden in nature, which is brought into activity by the divine omnipotence; and he could therefore define the miracle as an act of God. calling forth that which is hidden in nature (hidden, that is, in relation to the *potentia obedientiae*) into activity, as a display of his almighty wisdom.[2]

[1] Nothing contra naturam, quae est materia primitus ordinata possibilis ad formas, quae sunt cursu naturae et quae sunt cursu mirabili, potentia obedientiae ad omnia opera divina sive mediante natura sive immediate creata est a principio.

[2] Miraculum est opus occultas naturas

So too, Albertus Magnus takes the supernatural in connection with the divine constitution of the world. He sees in everything that takes place, be it natural or supernatural, the realization of the constitution of the world in the divine reason, or the eternal Word, which alike embraces all things, — the divine ideas (*rationes, quae sunt in verbo*), in which everything that comes into being shines beforehand; in which it was predetermined what should exist, and when, and after what manner it should exist. These are the *primordiales rerum causae simpliciter*. They exist from eternity; and in these, God prefigures what should come into being in the works of nature, of grace, and in the kingdom of glory, according to the ordinary course of nature, or according to the order of grace or by miracles; and nothing can ever take place except what has here been determined. He distinguishes, like Alexander of Hales, that which is grounded in the receptive, original constitution of nature, is prepared in it as to possibility, and that which may come to exist through the agency of the powers dwelling in her, her own self-activity. "If we look at the former,[1] there is given in every creature the capacity for everything, which can be formed out of it by the will of God. And in this regard, one may say, that in nature, in the original creation, was implanted this possibility, as well in relation to that which takes place according to the ordinary course of nature as in relation to miracles.[2] In this sense, an event may not be contradictory to nature, even though it should contradict the ordinary course of nature.[3] But if we look at the second, that which takes place according to the ordinary course of nature is grounded in the original forces of nature (*materiae naturali insertum*), is implanted in the matter of the world; but what takes place in a miraculous manner, lies hid within God's almighty power and constitution of the world; for God has from eternity arranged, in his eternal Word, whatsoever takes place, and when and how it should take place, and with this divine arrangement nothing can interfere.[4] If we understand nature in the highest sense, the *primordiales causas primae conditionis*, and *rationes causales*, then nothing seems to take place contrary to the original nature of things (*contra naturam primo insitam rebus*); for, in the sense described, God has also implanted the *causales rationes et primordiales* of miracles in things. With these God cannot be at variance, any more than he can deny himself, deny his own wisdom.[5] It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish from one another that which nature is capable of producing by the forces implanted in her, and by her own agency, and that in which she shows herself simply passive in

in actum reducens ad ostensionem sapientiae virtuosae. Summae, p. ii. Qu. 42.

[1] The prima radix possibilitatis obedientiae.

[2] Possibilitas tam ad consuetum naturae, quam ad miracula in principio conditionis inserta est materiae naturali.

[3] Not quod Deus faciat contra legem naturae aequissimam et naturalissimam, quam ipse naturae indidit, sed contra consuetum et nobis notum cursum naturae.

[4] Hence the distinction: Potentiae sive rationes sive virtutes ad miracula non sunt inditae materiae mundi nisi per potentiam obedientiae, per rationes autem causales in Deo sunt.

[5] Sicut non potest facere contra seipsum, ita non potest facere contra rationes illas et contra opus suum sapienter dispositum

relation to a higher inworking. Thus, God has furnished nature with everything requisite for the realization of the ends correspondent to her, but so constituted her, at the same time, that she should receive into herself still higher powers, and produce still higher effects."[1] He distinguishes that which takes place *contra*, *praeter*, and *supra naturam*. The first, is when God, according to his secret plan of the world, the ideas in which all things were prefigured (*ex causis rationalibus in se ipso absconditis*) produces, from some object or other, a thing which had not already been prefigured and prepared in it by the seminal principle implanted within it (*quod seminaliter non inest in ipso*). *Praeter naturam*, is that which does not in itself, indeed, transcend the power of nature, that which has been produced from these powers bearing within themselves, by constitution and in the germ, everything that is at sometime or other to appear in manifestation ;[2] but which, however, could not of itself proceed from the developing process of nature from within herself, but presupposes a certain inworking from without upon the forces hidden within her,[3] an impulse whereby the process of natural development is hastened, the separated forces in her are rapidly concentrated, so that something is accomplished at once, which nature could have produced only through a gradual and slow development.[4] *Supra naturam*, but not *contra naturam*, is that which could not come about indeed at all by natural powers, which therefore is purely supernatural, like the second; but which still, however, stands so related to nature, as to find first in her its completion ; as, for example, the appearance of Christ.[5] " He affirms, again, a certain analogy between the natural and supernatural, in so far as, in fact, even that whereby corrupted nature is restored, must be the same with or something similar to that whereby the nature was originally constituted.[6] Thomas Aquinas unfolds this idea as follows :[7] " If we look at the order of the world as it proceeds from the primal cause, nothing can happen contrary to this order of the world, which has its ground in God ; for if God brought to pass anything at variance with it, he would act against his foreknowledge, his will, or his goodness. But if we look at the order of the world, as it is grounded in the cosmical chain of causes and effects,[8] then God may bring to

[1] Quod creator nihil commodorum negavit naturae in his, quae sunt in natura secundum causales rationes sufficienter deducentes ad actum, quia in hīs passivum proportionatum est activo et e converso activum passivo. In his autem, quae tantum obedientialiter sunt in natura et quae secundum causales rationes pertinent ad causam superiorem, negavit commoda, quia haec ad naturam non pertinent, sed ad causam superiorem.

[2] The causae seminales.

[3] Non modo natura ab intrinsecus generante, sed extrinsecus adhibitis motibus et fomentis.

[4] Hoc quod secundum ordinem naturae paulatim operantis produceretur, velocius et repente producitur.

[5] Quod in potestate naturae nullo modo potest esse, et tamen ad naturam se habet ut perfectio naturae.

[6] Sunt ad simile in specie causae seminales et obedientales, et hoc ideo, quod seminales sunt ad institutionem naturae, obedientales autem et causales ad corruptae naturae restaurationem nec potest corrupta natura restaurari nisi per eadem aut similia, quibus instituta est, et ideo omne miraculum deducit ad aliquid simile naturae. See the Summa, p. ii, Tract. viii. Quaest. xxx, seqq.

[7] Summa, lib. i, Quaest. cv, Artic. vi.

[8] The causae secundae.

pass something *praeter ordinem rerum*, understood according to this latter sense; because *he* is not tied and limited to this series of causes and effects; but, on the contrary, the order of the world thereon reposing depends on him, as it proceeds from him, not by any necessity of nature, but by his own freewill. As the *ordo naturae* is implanted by God in things (*ordo rebus inditus*), so that which takes place *praeter hunc ordinem*, is not contrary to nature." He now raises the objection, "God would be a mutable being, if he acted contrary to the order of things established by himself." To this he replies: "That God, in implanting a certain order in things, still reserved to himself the right of sometimes, for cause, acting otherwise.[1] Considered in reference to the divine omnipotence, nothing, we must allow, can be called a miracle; for, compared with this, everything is little.

The miracle is so called only in reference to the capability of nature, which some event transcends.[2] Hence, different degrees of miraculous power may be supposed." In his inquiry respecting the idea of the miracle, in his commentary on the Sentences,[3] he starts, like Albertus Magnus, with making the distinction between the *rationes causales vel obedientales*, and the *rationes seminales* in nature. And he too places the supernatural, not in an infringement of the former, but of the latter. Accurately understood, however, the miracle, even in relation to the latter, is not an event running counter to them, but exalted above them, — one that takes place independent of them:[4] an event exalted above them when God produces an effect, which nature must ever fall short of, as the form of a glorified body; or when he produces an effect, to which nature is competent, without the mediation of natural causes, as in the changing of water into wine. But he does nothing contrary to nature; for he cannot so order it that the operative causes in nature, while still remaining the same in kind, should produce essentially different effects, any more than that a thing should be the same and different at the same time. In the second book,[5] he distinguishes two several conceptions of the miraculous; the relatively such to a particular individual, when the natural causes which give rise to the phenomenon are concealed from him; and the miraculous in itself, the cause of which is one *simpliciter occulta;* so that if the powers of nature had been fol lowed, it must have taken place otherwise.[6] Of this kind is whatever is brought to pass immediately by the divine power, which is the most hidden of causes.[7] How miracles are comprised in the divine order

[1] Quod Deus sic rebus certum ordinem indidit, ut tamen sibi ipsi reservaret, quod ipse aliquando aliter ex causa esset facturus. Unde, cum praeter hunc ordinem agit, non mutatur.

[2] Quod nihil potest dici miraculum ex comparatione potentiae divinae, quia quodcunque factum divinae potentiae comparatum est minimum. Sed dicitur aliquid miraculum per comparationem ad facultatem naturae, quam excedit. Summa, lib. i, Qu. cv, Art. viii. [3] Dist. 42, Qu. ii, Art. ii.

[4] Proprie loquendo tunc etiam contra eas non facit, sed praeter eas vel supra eas.

[5] Distinct. 18, Quaest. i, Artic. iii.

[6] Ita etiam, quod in re est aliqua virtus secundum rei veritatem, per quam aliter debeat contingere.

[7] Haec proprie miracula, quasi in seipsis et simpliciter mira.

of the world, and serve along with the effects that proceed from natural causes to reveal the divine providence, he explains again in his work *Contra gentes*,[1] in perfect accordance with what he teaches in the *Summa*. "There are, indeed," he says in this latter work, "many abnormal effects in nature, which do not correspond with what usually takes place, while still the order of providence in nowise changes. If then it may be so brought about by creaturely power, that the course of nature, without any change of the divine providence, may suffer such change as to allow of phenomena deviating from what commonly appear, then, *a fortiori*, the divine power may, without any infringement on providence, sometimes bring to pass an event otherwise than as it would take place in the natural order of things. This serves especially to make it manifest that all nature is subject to God's will; and that the order of nature does not spring from a natural necessity, but from his freewill. And it can be no matter of surprise, that God should effect something in nature with a view to reveal himself to the souls of men, when we consider that rational beings are the end in which all corporeal being terminates. But the end of rational beings is the knowledge of God; it can be no matter of surprise, therefore, if a change should take place in corporeal nature for the purpose of communicating to rational beings the knowledge of God." Raymund Lull refers those who refuse to admit anything supernatural, to the creation of the world from nothing, as the greatest miracle.[2] "In nature," says he, "are many and great mysteries; and the human understanding is not competent to know and comprehend all the works of nature; for the power of nature to work according to her own course, is far greater than the power of the human soul to understand the works of nature.[3] If, then, man finds himself so limited in the knowledge of nature, how should he be able to understand everything supernatural; especially if he is disposed to conceive what lies beyond the limits of nature as something embraced within them?"[4] "Neither the natural nor the supernatural," he affirms, "can be rightly understood except in their connection with each other. The understanding of the one conditions the understanding of the other."[5] The tendency to the supernatural, he considers as the characteristic of the Christian age and position, proceeding from faith in the incarnation of God, as compared with antiquity, which leaned towards nature.[6]

[1] Lib. iii, c. xcix.

[2] Valde mirum est, Domine, de hominibus discredentibus, nam quoniam negant et discredunt esse rem contra cursum naturae, quare non respiciunt nec perpendunt esse mundi, quod est magis impossibile secundum cursum naturae, quam sit impossibile, te esse Deum et hominem simul? nam mundus de privatione devenit in esse per tuam voluntatem et non per cursum naturae, t. ix, f. 39.

[3] Adeo magna et multa sunt secreta naturae, quod non possint omnia percipi ab homine, quoniam multo major est possibilitas, quam natura habet ad operandum secundum suum cursum.

[4] Et maxime si hoc inquirat intra terminos naturae, intra quos non sunt inclusae res, quae non sunt secundum cursum naturae? t. ix, f. 401.

[5] Opera naturae percipiuntur per opera, quae sunt supra naturam, et opera, quae sunt supra naturam, percipiuntur per opera naturae, quoniam alia sunt aliis occasio, ut percipiantur. L. c. f. 402.

[6] Benedictus sis, Domine, quia a tempore tuae incarnationis plus tractant et cogitant homines in tuis operibus, quam in

In connection with the doctrine of miracles, we should here notice the peculiar views of Roger Bacon, who endeavors to explain certain marvels wrought by the power of man's *word*, from the potentiated natural power of mind, to which the uttered word serves as a natural organ. "Every action of man is stronger and mightier when he bends his mind thereto with firmness of purpose, and confidently expects to compass what he aims at. And because the word is formed out of the thought and longing of man's heart, and man has his joy in it, and it is the most connatural instrument of the rational soul, therefore has it the power of producing the greatest effects of all that is done by man; especially when it proceeds from a sure intention, a great desire, and a strong confidence. A proof of this is, that all the miracles wrought by holy men were, from the first, performed by the power of words."[1]

When we enter into the investigations of these theologians respecting the relation of the divine foreknowledge and predestination to creaturely freedom, we ought not to forget, that the Augustinian system swayed the religious consciousness and thinking of this age; as in fact, this ground-tendency ever constituted the most important difference, though the one of which there was the least consciousness on both sides, between the occidental and the oriental churches. Starting from the principles of Augustin, these writers were carried, by the stern consistency of monistic speculation, to the point of sacrificing the freedom of the creature, notwithstanding all their pains to rescue it. And here, too, while we see how a well-authorized practical interest was forced to give way, in speculative minds, to the stiff and rigid consistency of thought, we cannot fail to mark also the extent of mischief which arose from a confounding of the philosophical and religious points of view in theology. But the power of the ethical element within them, and their good sense, appear in this, that they attempted, at least in appearance, to maintain freedom, to remove the causality of evil from God, and to avoid everything calculated to shock the moral sensibility of mankind. Their skilful dialectics, and their custom of resorting to the arts which Augustin had already employed in such a variety of ways, stood them greatly in stead.

Anselm composed a tract on the question, How divine foreknowledge and predestination could be reconciled with freewill? He makes out an answer by resorting to distinctions, which might serve the purpose, no doubt, of guarding against many misconceptions, many extravagant

operibus naturae, et per hoc significatur, quod ipsi sint plus in tempore gratiae post tuam incarnationem, quam ante ipsam, quando philosophi plus tractabant de operibus naturae, quam de tuis. De contemplat. in Deum vol. ii, lib. iii, Dist. 28, c. cli, f. 349.

[1] Omnis operatio hominis est fortior et impetuosior, quando ad eam est multum sollicitus et voluntarius et fixo proposito firmat intentionem et sperat firmiter, se posse consequi, quod intendit. Quia verbum ab interioribus membris naturalibus generatur et formatur ex cogitatione et sollicitudine, et delectatur homo in eo, et propriissimum est instrumentum animae rationalis, ideo maximam efficaciam habet inter omnia, quae fiunt ab homine, praecipue cum ex intentione certa, desiderio magno et vehementi confidentia profertur, Cujus signum est, quod omnia fere miracula, quae facta sunt per sanctos, a principio fiebant per virtutem verborum. Opus majus, f. 252

and ugly positions; but which were not suited to remove the real difficulty. His doctrine is this: "Divine foreknowledge by no means excludes free self-determination. The necessary and the free, God knows beforehand, each in its own way. All depends on distinguishing the standing-point of eternity and that of development in time. As there is no contradiction in this, that, viewed from the standing-point of eternity, everything is an immediate present, which in the unfolding of time is a past and a future, so it easily admits also of being reconciled, that what from the standing-point of eternity exhibits itself as immutable and necessary, should, in relation to temporal development, appear to be free and mutable, as dependent on the creaturely free self-determination.[1] Paul, in Rom. 8: 28, employs the perfect tense, — even when speaking of an action yet future, — for the purpose of denoting, by this circumstance, that he had not in view here a temporal action, but was constrained to use this expression — by the poverty of language — to denote the immediate presence of eternity;[2] since that which is once past is immutable, like the eternal."[3] Now it is quite evident that, by this distinction of the two points of view, nothing is gained as yet for the defence of freedom. This distinction would much rather serve directly to make contingency a mere appearance, necessary in order to temporal development, — so that what is fixed in the divine plan of the world as something necessary, should be actually realized, only in the form of a seeming contingency. Anselm himself, cannot avoid observing the consequences which might be derived from his positions: "Must not the causes of good and evil fall back then, on God, if he knows nothing as a mere fact (therefore, not even evil), but his foreknowledge precedes everything?" To this he answers, that "Everything positive comes from God; but evil is a negative thing. Even in evil actions, all that is positive comes from him, but not evil, which consists just in the want of that *rectitudo voluntatis*, which comes from God."[4] By these distinctions, however, when taken in connection with the positions above noticed, the acknowledgment of a freedom simply self-determining, — not determined from without, as the cause of evil, — is by no means placed clearly beyond doubt. There is something more real in the acute distinctions, by means of which Hugo a St. Victore endeavors to make the freedom in sin consistent with the acknowledgment of the divine omnipotence and providence to which all things are subjected. He says: "We must distinguish from each other the act of willing in itself, and the direction of the will to a particular object. Willing in itself, is purely the act of the man; but as soon as it directs itself to particular objects, it finds itself limited by the divine order of the world, so that it can take only the

[1] Hoc propositum, secundum quod vocati sunt sancti, in aeternitate, in qua non est praeteritum vel futurum, sed tantum praesens, immutabile est, sed in ipsis hominibus ex libertate arbitrii aliquando est mutabile.

[2] Propter indigentiam verbi, significantis aeternam praesentiam, usum esse verbis praeteritae significationis.

[3] Ad similitudinem aeterni praesentis omnino immutabilia.

[4] Deus facit omnes actiones et omnes motus, quia ipse facit res, a quibus et ex quibus et per quas et in quibus fiunt.

direction where the way has been left open for it by the latter. Accordingly, evil, in its manifestation, is limited by the divine order of the world; and must, like all things else, be subservient to the same."[1]

Proceeding on the foundation laid in the twelfth century, the theologians of the thirteenth carried their investigations still further. Alexander of Hales, also, starts with the position that what takes place in time cannot stand to the divine knowledge in the relation of a mere datum or fact, because the temporal cannot be conceived as the cause of the eternal, nor the knowledge of God as depending on something else. In order to reconcile the divine foreknowledge with the contingency of free actions, he distinguishes that which is necessary in itself, and that which is necessary in certain connections, under certain suppositions,— unconditional and conditioned necessity.[2] Alexander of Hales is the first of these schoolmen in whom we meet with the notion of a "fate;" and this notion from henceforth becomes a dominant one in the scholastic theology. When we look at the divine order of the world, as it exists in the divine reason, we have the idea of Providence. When we look at its manifestations, in the series of causes and effects in the phenomenal world, we are presented with the idea of "fate."[3] Foreknowledge, in so far as it is the *exemplaris ratio* in the *arte divina*, is called *providentia;* in so far as it exhibits itself in *re vel effectu operis*, it is called *fatum*. Freewill and fate stand in no contradiction with each other; for if by fate must be understood the coöperation of all causes directed by some higher law, then freewill is one of those causes.[4] By it, the operations of free, as well as of natural causes are all directed together, after a manner corresponding to their respective and proper essences. The actions of freewill are prevented, only by the connection in which fate places them, from overstepping the limits prescribed by Divine Providence.[5] God knows evil, but it is from the good; as the same art embraces the knowledge of that which agrees with its laws, and of that which violates them. So, if light could see itself and its effects, it would know that one thing is receptive of light, and another not; which is the same as darkness; — by means of itself, then, it would know itself and darkness." Alexander of Hales reckons evil as something that contributes to display the harmony of the universe: "By comparison with the evil, the good shines forth more conspicuously in

[1] In velle et vitium est, in quantum velle ex voluntate mala, et ordo est, in quantum ad hoc vel ad hoc ex disponente est. Potest ergo voluntas mala in se corrumpi et resolvi per proprium vitium, quod ei aliunde non datur, sed non potest per velle extra se praecipitari, nisi qua ei via aperitur. God is not auctor ruendi, sed incedendi ordinator. De sacramentis fidei, lib. i, p. v, c. xxix.

[2] Necessitas consequentiae et necessitas consequentis, necessitas antecedens et necessitas consequens, necessitas absoluta et ordinis.

[3] The distinction: Dispositio, quae est in disponente et dispositio, quae est in re disposita. Dispositio in disponente est exemplar, dispositio in disposito est ordo deductus ab ipso exemplari et est forma exemplata in ipsa re.

[4] Ipsum liberum nostrum arbitrium est una causarum, secundum cujus ordinationem ad suos effectus currit series fati.

[5] Connexione fatali coërcentur ab evagatione limitum divinae providentiae sive determinatorum a divina providentia.

its own essence."[1] After the same manner, Albertus Magnus: "The primal ground and original type of all that is done, or can be done, whether by men or by angels, is the divine Providence.[2] Fate is that orderly arrangement, originating in Providence, which is stamped on the whole series of created things, and reveals itself in the connection of natural and voluntary causes.[3] Providence and fate are distinguished from each other, as type and antitype,— formative cause and the form actually incorporated in things.[4] The *causae contingentes*, as well as freewill,— the true and proximate causes of whatever takes place,— though subordinated to fate, do not lose their causality; and thus the same effects under different relations spring from providence, from fate, and from freewill. By fate, evil itself is ordered for good,— that is to say, so ordered that good must come out of it;[5] and evil, in relation to the whole, is evil no longer; it is taken up by the order of fate, which does not compel to evil, but subdues it to order when it has once broken in."[6] Albert endeavors to point out, from the analogy of nature, the connection between God's creative, preserving, and governing agency, the connection between creation and providence,— how one is already implied in the other: "As in nature, it is the same power which brings forth a formative principle in the seed, produces from the seed, and guides that which is produced, in its development,[7] by extending its influence to each member in particular, and at the same time communicates to the entire product a quality and character, by virtue of which each individual member is conducted onward to its proper destination, and each finds its right place in the order of the whole;[8] so in the Creator of the whole world, the power is the same by which he created the world, and by which he continues to work in each individual thing, and in the organism of the whole,— appointing to each its proper place and guiding the development of all the individuals in the connected system, so that every individual maintains its proper position in the order of the whole.[9]

The rigid consistency of thought, stiffly adhering to an abstract unity of principle, and impelling to the denial of freedom, in spite of every seeming affirmation of it, is most strongly apparent in Thomas Aquinas, as every one must see who — without allowing himself to be embarrassed by isolated expressions — brings together all that he

[1] Propter ipsam bonorum pulchritudinem permisit Deus mala fieri.

[2] Prima ratio et forma exemplaris.

[3] The dispositio exemplata a providentia, influxa et impressa rebus creatis secundum totum ordinem causarum naturalium et voluntariarum rebus inhaerens et quasi impressa et incorporata rebus creatis.

[4] Ut exemplar et exemplatum, causa influens et forma influxa.

[5] Ipsum malum ordinem boni habet, ut scilicet bonum eliciatur ab ipso.

[6] Quae non cogit ad malum, sed etiam ipsum factum ordinat.

[7] Una et eadem virtus, quae formativa est in semine et factiva sive generativa nati, quae efficitur regitiva ejus, quod natum est.

[8] Eo quod influit unicuique membro particulariter et toti simul talem dispositionem, per quam unumquodque ad suum ordinem deducitur et singula in toto suis nectuntur ordinibus naturalibus.

[9] Ut quaequae ordinibus suis connectantur. Only occasionaliter ex ordinatione providentiae mala fieri est bonum et utile et universitati et facienti et patienti.

says in different places into systematic connection: we shall endeavor to gather together the main points of his doctrine under such a total intuition. "God knows all things in an eternal manner, as immediately present.[1] Hence, things contingent are also known by God after an infallible manner, as present; and still, the future is a thing contingent, when taken in connection *with the causes* from which it immediately proceeds.[2] Although the highest cause is one that operates with necessity, yet the effect may be something contingent, on account of the proximate cause, which is one that operates contingently." He affirms that God's will works many, not all things, after a necessary manner. Now, as a reason for this proposition, it was said by many that God works partly by necessary, and partly by contingent, causes. But against this view he had two objections: "First, the effect of the first cause may, in relation to the second cause, be a contingent one; if the effect of the first cause is hindered by the deficiency of the second, as the effect of the sun may be hindered by a defect in the plant. But no defect in a second cause can prevent the will of God from bringing about its effect. Next, if we stopped short with the distinction of contingent and necessary causes, it would follow from this, that something might proceed from the former in opposition to the will of God; which could not be reconciled with the fact of the divine omnipotence. Hence, we must prefer to seek the reason of it in the will of God. As this is the most mighty cause, so it follows not only that everything takes place that he wills, but also in the manner that he wills. But now it is God's will that some things should take place in a necessary, and others in a contingent manner, in order to the preservation of the order of the universe.[3] There are, then, but two different forms ordered to this end by God himself, in which forms his will is realized."[4] Connected with this is also the fact that Thomas Aquinas, in opposition to those who supposed a *grace* conditioned on the right use of freewill, and a *predestination* conditioned on the divine foreknowledge with regard to this right use, maintained that all this is already comprised among the effects of predestination and presupposed by it.[5] It was impossible to distinguish what proceeded from freewill and what from predestination; as it was impossible also to distinguish what proceeded from the first, and what from the second cause; for the divine providence brings forth its effects *through* the agency of second causes. "All leads back to the goodness of God. To this must be traced the reason why some are predestinated, others reprobated. The goodness of God, which in itself is simple, must manifest itself in the phenomenal world after manifold ways; because created things cannot arrive at the sim-

[1] Ejus intuitus fertur ab aeterno supra omnia, prout sunt in sua praesentialitate.

[2] Et tamen sunt futura contingentia, suis causis proximis comparata.

[3] Ut sit ordo in rebus ad complementum universi.

[4] Non igitur propterea effectus voliti a Deo eveniunt contingenter, quia causae proximae sunt contingentes, sed propterea, quia Deus voluit eos contingenter evenire, contingentes causas ad eos praeparavit.

[5] Manifestum est, quod id quod est gratiae est praedestinationis effectus, et hoc non potest poni ut ratio praedestinationis, cum hoc sub praedestinatione concludatur.

plicity of the divine essence. Hence, different grades, from the highest to the lowest point of the scale, were required in order to the completion of the universe. And to preserve these manifold stages and gradations in things, God permits many things evil to happen in order that much good may not be prevented.[1] The human race, as a whole, may be contemplated as the universe. It was God's will to manifest his goodness to a part of mankind, – those whom he had foreordained to this end,—in the form of mercy sparing them; to others, the reprobate, in the form of punitive justice. And this is the reason why he elected some and rejected others; and the ground of this difference lies only in the divine will. It is the same with nature, where, indeed, a reason can be given why God caused a part of the one original matter to take the form of fire or of water; namely, in order that a diversity might exist among natural things; but why one part of the matter exists under this form and another part under that depends upon the simple will of God,—just as it depends solely on the will of the artisan why one stone is in this and another in that part of the wall,—though his art may render a reason why in general some stones are in this others in that particular wall.[2] This idea of a necessary manifoldness in the universe is generally a predominant one with him. Such a manifoldness of creatures is necessary in order that one may supply what another lacks in manifesting the divine goodness.[3] Thus also evil appears to him as necessary, in order to the completion of the universe in its manifoldness. "The universe is better and more complete, if there are some beings in it capable of falling from goodness, and who sometimes do actually fall, in that God does not prevent it; because it is the part of providence not to destroy nature, but to preserve it.[4] It is in the very nature of things, however, that a being who is capable of falling should sometimes actually fall.[5] And since, as Augustin remarks, God is so mighty that he can make even evil subservient to good, so much good would be wanting if there were no evil.[6] In evil, as action, everything positive[7] leads back to the first cause; but not so in reference to evil in itself, which consists in apostasy; just as in the case of a person who limps, all that belongs to the motion proceeds from the moving power, but that which is defective, not from this, but from the defect in the bone."[8]

[1] Necesse est, quod divina bonitas, quae in se est una et simplex, multiformiter repraesentetur in rebus, propter hoc quod res creatae ad simplicitatem divinam attingere non possunt. Et inde est, quod ad completionem universi requiruntur diversi gradus rerum, quarum quaedam altum et quaedam infimum locum teneant in universo. Et ut uniformitas graduum conservetur in rebus, Deus permittit aliqua mala fieri, ne multa bona impediantur.

[2] Summa, p. i, Quaest. xxiii, Artic. v.

[3] Produxit res in esse, propter suam bonitatem communicandam creaturis et per eas repraesentandam, et quia per unam creaturam sufficienter repraesentari non potest, produxit multas creaturas et diversas, ut quod deest uni ad repraesentandam divinam bonitatem, suppleatur ex alia; nam bonitas, quae in Deo est simpliciter et uniformiter, in creaturis est multipliciter et divisim, unde perfectius participat divinam bonitatem et repraesentat eam totum universum, quam alia quaecunque creatura. Quaest. xlvii, Artic. i.

[4] According to Dionysius Areopagita.

[5] Ipsa autem natura rerum hoc habet, ut quae deficere possunt, quandoque deficiant.

[6] Quaest. xlviii, Artic. ii.

[7] Id quod habet entitatis et perfectionis.

[8] Et similiter quicquid est entitatis et actionis in actione mala, reducitur in Deum

Knowledge in God, Thomas compares with the knowledge of the artist in relation to his work. "Knowledge, as knowledge, does not imply indeed causality; but in so far as it is a knowledge belonging to the artist who forms, it stands in the relation of causality to that which is produced by his art. The knowledge of the artist, first shows the end; next, the will proposes this end; then the will prescribes the action, by which the idea conceived by knowledge is to be realized. But whatever occurs in the execution, through any deviation from the idea of the artist, or from the end proposed, cannot be referred to the knowledge of the artist, as the cause; therefore evil, which is a deviation from the divine idea and the divine end, cannot be referred to God's knowledge as the cause.[1] According to this it might seem as if, in the opinion of Thomas, evil must be considered as a thing having no place in the divine idea; that it is to be ascribed, as being a deviation from that idea, to creaturely freedom; hence arises a contrariety between that idea and its manifestation. Then the redemption only would be referred back to the divine causality, as an act of God for the removal of this contrariety that had sprung out of the abuse of creaturely freedom. But if we take what Thomas here says in connection with those thoughts of his which we have just before explained, it will be evident that he cannot ascribe so much importance to creaturely freedom, to the working of second causes, as to suppose that the accomplishment of the divine ideas should actually be hindered thereby for a single moment. According to his mode of contemplation, everything must, in the last resort, certainly be referred back to the divine causality; and everything appears only as a necessary instrumentality for its going into effect in the development of time. Evil itself appears as something necessary in the connected series of these instrumentalities; only, as evil, it has no place with the rest, in the divine idea. If we consider, again, that according to the doctrine of Thomas, God's knowledge is one with his being, his essence, it follows from this, that the form in which everything is evolved in the phenomenal world, necessarily corresponds to the way in which everything is ordained from eternity in that knowledge which is identical with the divine being. No room is left remaining here for creaturely freedom as true causality. Consistently carried out, such a proposition would have produced a pantheistic monism, which, however, as the antagonist of Almaric of Bena, he would avoid. We have no need, on this point, to confine ourselves barely to the commentary of Thomas, on the book *De Causis*, with regard to which it might be said that, treating the matter altogether objectively, he has unfolded the views of another, rather than his own. Even where he exhibits none but his own ideas, we shall still meet with such thoughts. "God," says he, "knows all things in himself;[2] his being is his knowing; under the form of knowledge, all effects are prefigured in the

sicut in causam, sed quod est ibi defectus, non causatur a Deo, sed ex causa secunda deficiente.

[1] Unde patet, quod malum, quod est deviatio a forma et a fine, non causatur a scientia Dei. In Sentent. lib. i, Distinct. 38, Quaest. i, Artic. i.

[2] Quod ipsum esse causae agentis primae est ejus intelligere. Unde quicunque effectus praeexistunt in Deo, sicut in causa

highest cause. God works in all; yet in each according to its own peculiar constitution;[1] hence he works in natural things so as to communicate to them the power for activity, and to determine their nature to this or that action; but he works in the free will so as to impart to it the power to act; and, under God's agency, the free will is active;[2] but still, the determination and the end of the action stands in the power of the free will; therefore, the control over its own actions remains to it, though not so as in the case of the first cause;" and by the limitation here introduced, the whole may again be brought round to the proposition that all must, in the end, be referred back to the *causa prima*, which works through all the instrumentalities established by itself.[3]

How far Thomas is from really acknowledging the free will to be an independent causality, appears evident from the way in which he repels the objection that, by his doctrine, freewill is annihilated. He says, God works in the free will as the nature of it requires that he should; although, therefore, he changes the will of man to another direction, nevertheless, by his almighty power, he causes that man should freely will the change which he experiences;[4] and thus all constraint is removed. For to suppose otherwise, that the man willed not the change which is a change in his will, would involve a contradiction.[5]

We recognize the profound and acute discernment of Raymund Lull, in his mode of treating these subjects; but in his case also it is plainly apparent that, in seeking to vindicate freedom, he is driven, in spite of himself, by the monistic tendency of his speculation, into the denial of it. He too, like Thomas Aquinas, distinguishes two different points of view in which things may be contemplated; *first*, as they subsist after an eternal mode in God, or in the idea which is one with God; *second*, as they manifest themselves in temporal evolution. "The world and its parts existed from eternity in the divine reason, by the idea or the ideas; for the divine reason suffers nothing of its essence, and of the essence of its attributes, to pass without itself,[6] so the seal, which is impressed on wax, or the image reflected in a mirror, remains in itself the same. When God created the world, nothing that belongs to the being of the idea was transferred, in this act of creating, without himself; else this idea would be subject to change, would not remain the eternal one, which is impossible, since this idea is God himself.[7] But God willed that, from nothing, should be created that which he had

prima, necesse est, quod sint in ipso ejus intelligere et quod omnia in eo sint secundum modum intelligibilem. Nam omne, quod est in altero, est in eo secundum modum ejus in quo est. Summa, p. i, Quaest. xiv, Artic. v. God knows all things in se ipso, in quantum essentia sua continet similitudinem aliorum ab ipso. The scientia Dei non causa mali, sed boni, per quod cognoscitur malum. L. c. Artic. x.

[1] Ita tamen, quod in unoquoque secundum ejus conditionem.

[2] Ut virtutem agendi sibi ministret et ipso operante liberum arbitrium agat.

[3] Sentent. lib. i, Distinct. 25, Quaest. i, Artic. i.

[4] Etiamsi voluntatem hominis in aliud mutet, nihilominus tamen hoc sua omnipotentia facit, ut illud, in quod mutatur, voluntarie velit.

[5] Sentent. lib. i, Distinct. 25, Quaest. i, Artic. iii.

[6] Nihil extra mittente.

[7] Idea esset alterata, et non aeterna, quod est impossibile, quum idea sit Deus.

with himself, from eternity, by the idea;[1] and what he willed, his almighty power could perform. That which exists, after an eternal manner, in him, could not pass into the forms of quantity, time, motion.[2] We must, accordingly, distinguish between created being, as such, as it unfolds itself and appears in time, and as it exists, simply in and for itself, comprehended by the divine wisdom from eternity.[3] And that which divine wisdom conceives, after an immediate manner, is the idea.[4] God's creative and his preserving agency are to be distinguished from each other only as immediate and mediated agencies. As all things must, alike, be referred back to God's creative power, whether that power be exerted directly, as in the creation from nothing, or through creatures as its instruments; so, creation and preservation are the same.[5] The intermediate instrument of God's preserving agency is the implanted *vis conservativa* residing in things, to which all other agencies coming from without are only subservient." This distinction, between the immediate and the mediate agency of God, he employs for the purpose of explaining the doctrine of predestination.[6] "The predestinated is, in idea, God himself; since the idea and God are the same: this predestination is, therefore, infallible and immutable. But predestination, so far as it concerns a created man, is a new one. And although the new-created man is not, in essence, different from the man of the idea, yet he differs from the same, in so far as a created man exists under the forms of quantity, space, and time; and, in this regard, his salvation is not a necessary thing, for God works here by the way of means. He predestinated Peter through the merit of his good works, as he gives warmth by means of the sun and fire. So was it, also, with the perdition of Judas; all depends, here, upon our having regard to middle causes, so as not to impinge on the divine order and rectitude.[7] The human mind may present a thing as questionable, conceive of it as possible, which cannot be so contemplated in the divine mind, where the question falls null of itself, since it belongs to a case that cannot once be supposed, in relation to thought in God. What man conceives as possible, viewed from the position of bare abstract thought, is a thing that can find no place in the chain of actual

[1] Sed divina voluntas voluit, quod de nihilo esset creatum hoc, quod ab aeterno habuit per ideam.

[2] Respecting time and space, he explains himself in the liber contemplationis in Deum, vol. iii, lib. iv, Distinct. 38, c. cclxvii, t. x, f. 141. As the union of matter and form constitutes body, so potence and act constitute time. Time is the intermediate between potential and actual being. Because in God all is actus, therefore in him there is no time.

[3] Ens creatum secundum hoc, quod est simpliciter per se simpliciter comprehensum ab aeterno per divinam sapientiam.

[4] See Quaest super lib. Sentent. i, Qu. xxvii, Opp. t. iv, f. 27.

[5] Et quia creatio ita est per creare creaturam, quae conservat aliam creaturam, sicut est per creare illam creaturam conservatam, ergo sequitur quod creatio et conservatio sint idem. Qu. xxxviii.

[6] Vide Quaest. super lib. Sentent. i, Qu. xxxiii.

[7] Thus we must distinguish una praedestinatio, quae est Deus, et alia praedestinatio quae est effectus, et in novo subjecto sustentata et creata, et hoc sine mutatione divini intellectus, qui non mutatur per suum effectum, cum suus effectus non sit novus in quantum idea, sed est novus quoad seipsum, cum ex nihil de novo sit productus.

existence."[1] In his work, entitled *Contemplatio in Deum*,[2] he endeavors to show that neither predestination nor foreknowledge (*praescire*), on the part of God, carries with it any force of constraint, since this would stand in contradiction with the divine attributes of wisdom, justice, etc. "The palm-tree, by the course of nature, yields dates; the apple-tree, apples; so one man, Peter, by freewill, by his own unconstrained faculty and merit, brings forth good works; and another, William, by a nature equally unconstrained, evil works. As the cause in one case is the course of nature, in the difference of the two trees, so the cause in the other is a course of nature of another sort, in the difference of the two men.[3] But while nature, in the case of the two trees, necessitates (*constringit*) them to yield different fruits, each after its kind, there is, in the case of man, no such natural necessity constraining him to bring forth good or evil works, because here nature takes up freewill. He continually comes back upon the point, that predestination does not exclude second causes,—that it is a mistaken respect for divine wisdom, which leads men to ascribe too much force to predestination.[4] If the misunderstood-doctrine of predestination makes a man negligent in the practice of virtue and avoiding of sin, it were better that he had not meddled with it.[5] As one who, unknowingly, sows seeds which have lost their vitality, considers the seed productive, when it is not so, and supposes that possible, therefore, which in fact is not so;[6] so two individuals, of whom one is predestined to salvation, the other to perdition, not knowing to what they are predestined, both believe they have everlasting happiness and perdition within their control; and, because they consider this to be possible, there is in them an unconstrained freewill. As the sower supposes that wheat will grow from the spoiled seed, while however only that becomes actual which is determined beforehand in the seed; so Peter and William arrive at the end to which they are predestined by means of what they actually do, notwithstanding they suppose that to be possible to them, *potentialiter*, which is impossible to them both *potentialiter* and *actualiter*." He is aware of the mischievous practical consequences which might be drawn from this comparison, but justifies himself by saying that interest for the truth compelled him to write thus.[7] "All the works done by

[1] Quod Deus non possit damnare Petrum, nec salvare Judam, et tale non posse non est ens reale, sed intentionale in humano intellectu, cum Deus sicut non diligit salvare Judam et damnare Petrum, sic non intelligit damnare Petrum et salvare Judam. Quaest. xxxvi.

[2] Vol. iii, lib. iv, Distinct. 38, c. cclxv, t. x, f. 135.

[3] In anima rationali formantur diversa opera secundum formam, qua recipiuntur qualitates praedictae, quae formantur accidentaliter ad bona opera vel ad mala ratione accidentium separabilium, quae eveniunt iis.

[4] Ratio, quare homo dat praedestinationi majorem vim et potestatem, quam ipsa habeat, est, quia facit honorem et reverentiam tuae perfectae sapientiae imaginando, omnia, quae fuerunt et sunt et erunt, oportere esse, sicut ab ipsa sciuntur.

[5] Quo plus cognitio praedestinationis intrat in memoriam et intellectum hominis, eo plus debilitatur voluntas, eo quod praedestinatio sit nimis grave onus memoriae et intellectui et per debilitatem voluntatis fit homo piger in faciendo bonum et evitando malum.

[6] Fol. 142.

[7] Quia istud exemplum dat periculosam significationem, id hoc, quod possit plus nocere, quam prodesse, propterea non libenter ponitur et scribitur a nobis.

Peter and William, and the ways in which they do the same, are predestined to them, and yet they are done by them with freewill, apart from all constraint whatsoever. In respect to men as well as nature, everything takes place according to the divine predetermination; but, in the case of a natural being, as there is no freewill, so neither can there be merit or demerit. If the predestined Peter does a bad action, and the foreknown (*praescitus*) William a good one; the good is, to the human mind, a mark of predestination to everlasting happiness; the evil, a mark of predestination to perdition: while yet no change can, on this account, be supposed to have taken place in the divine councils.[1] Hence then the mistake, when the human mind undertakes to judge by these fallacious symptoms in temporal manifestation concerning predestination,[2] without having regard to the nature of the evolution in time, to the antithesis between potence and act, to the confinement of human reason, which cannot comprehend predestination after the perfect manner in which it is settled in the divine wisdom.[3] Such an absolute knowledge of predestination would, however, destroy what essentially constitutes the great principle of human ethics; and there would be nothing more to be said about freedom of choice in the will, or about guilt and desert.[4] But purely human action can only be found under the condition of this uncertainty in reference to predestination, whether one is predestined to everlasting happiness or misery. Now as the husbandman, who knows that the shocks of corn are potentially in the seed-kernel, must scatter the seed according to the measure of his knowledge, notwithstanding his ignorance about the result, just so must we act, in bringing forth good actions as a means of attaining to everlasting happiness; nor can uncertainty with regard to the divine decrees serve as an excuse for any man.[5] Suppose Peter predestined to represent to himself and will something that is good, and William something that is evil; we must say that, before they represented to themselves or willed this, both had freewill to represent to themselves and to will good and evil. Their determination having been freely made, goes as freely into execution.[6] They act freely, because each of them is conscious that he can do the opposite if he chooses. Although it is decreed that this individual shall kill that other, yet he acts with entire freedom. So if he cannot accomplish his purpose, if the arrow misses the mark, this also is predetermined. Yet with such an inten-

[1] Quia in te, Domine, non est defectus, ideo salvatio et damnatio non est alterabilis in eis, sed solum in operibus ipsorum.

[2] Quando figura actualis repraesentat falsitatem, sicut speculum falso repraesentat falsam figuram.

[3] Unde haec falsa figura praedestinationis formatur ratione temporis, quod est inter actum et potentiam et ratione defectus humani intellectus, qui non potest ita perfecte percipere praedestinationem, sicut tua sapientia eam scit. f. 143

[4] Si noster intellectus ita bene id, quod homini est praedestinatum, sciret sicut tua sapientia, non fieret homini falsa figura in praedestinatione, neque haberet homo liberam voluntatem, nec obligationem nec meritum in suis operibus.

[5] Et non excusat eum ignorantia, quam habet de salvatione vel damnatione, quam scit tua gloriosa essentia divina; c. cclxviii, f. 145.

[6] Voluntas venit libere ad potentiam motivam, quin sit constricta per praedestinationem.

tion, the guilt also is present, although the sensible instrument may fail of executing that intention." But it is easy to see with how little propriety the example could be employed for the purpose which Lull had in view, of proving that predestination generally had not the force of constraint, and did not destroy freedom of the will; for predestination certainly refers not barely to the outward action, but also to the inward determination of the will.[1] For the rest, he expresses the conviction that, in this doctrine, the discursive development falls very far short of the intuition.[2] And so he concludes this whole exposition, with the apology, *quod noster intellectus ipsam melius intelligat, quam nostra sensualitas potuerit scribere.*

From theology we now pass to anthropology, and shall consider the farther prosecution of the doctrine concerning man's primeval state, concerning the fall, and its consequences.

In anthropology, we must trace forward the threads of development from the earlier periods into the present age, in order to have a right understanding of its history. Important in their consequences, in this regard, were the opposite views that arose during the Pelagian controversies, which related, not barely to the present condition of human nature, to the acknowledgment or denial of its need of redemption, but also to the relation of human nature and of the created spirit, in itself considered, to God; the acknowledgment or denial of a moral autonomy of human nature. Augustin had applied the distinction of natural and supernatural, not merely to the condition of fallen man, but also to man in his primeval state; he had proceeded on the supposition that man, from the beginning, needed communion with God, in order to attain to the realization of that likeness to God for which his nature was destined, and hence he made use of the term *gratia*, in this sense, even in relation to the primeval state of man. Accordingly, this view passed over into the theology of the present period.

Anselm controverts[3] the Pelagian definition of freewill, as being the faculty of choice between good and evil. "The capability of choosing the last could not possibly, as he thought, be one of the necessary characters of this conception; for such a definition must, though differences might occur in its application, admit of being applied, in a certain degree, to all objects to which the thing denoted by this conception is to be attributed. But this character would not apply to those, to whom we must ascribe freedom in the highest sense, namely, God, and the spirits of the blessed. And the further a being is advanced in his moral development, the farther removed must he be from the possibility of choosing evil. A character which diminishes freedom when added, and increases it when absent, cannot then possibly form

[1] Quia motiva intellectualis est prior sensuali, est meritum in intellectuali, et licet sensualis non occidat Joannem, intellectualis jam est in peccato et culpa, eo quod, quia praedestinatio eam constringat, se obligat ad peccatum per liberam voluntatem, quia, si praedestinatio eam obligaret et constringeret, tunc eam obligaret ad nolendum occidere Joannem eo quod sit praedestinatum Gulielmo, non occidere eum, f. 147.

[2] Quia ista res in verbo et in scriptura non potest ita bene manifestari, sicut est in intellectu, f. 136.

[3] In his dialogue, De libero arbitrio.

a necessary character or mark of this conception.[1]" Accordingly, Anselm reduces the *formal* conception of freedom to a *material*, the *negative* to a positive *element*. Sin, in his opinion, supposes an original freedom, as the faculty of self-determination in a being who is good. But here enters in still another peculiar character connected with the point mentioned above, the application of the conception *gratia* to the primeval state of man. In order to repel, from the beginning, an autonomy of human nature, he defines freewill as a faculty to preserve the bent of the will, *once received*, to that which is good *for its own sake*, laying an emphasis on the phrase, *once received*.[2] The phrase, "for its own sake," is also an important clause considered from this point of view, that the love of goodness on its own account, gives to morality its true significance. The same definition may, according to this doctrine, be applied also to the angels. These too were created in the state of grace, and it depended solely on their freewill to persevere in communion with God and preserve what had been bestowed on them by grace. But the sin of Satan consisted in an arrogated autonomy, in the fact that he did not acquiesce in God's appointed order, but was for obtaining likeness to God *by his own will*.[3] By withstanding this temptation, the good angels attained to that state which Satan aspired to reach in a disorderly manner, and perseverance in the goodness originally communicated to them was their reward. This perseverance was made conditional on their "merit."[4] Robert Pullein acknowledges also the necessity of a *gratia coöperans* in the first man, without which he had no power to do anything good.[5] We find more exactly determined in his writings, what Anselm had left still vague and indefinite. "The angels," he teaches, "stood originally on the foundation of faith; it was made to depend upon the fact of their perseverance in good, whether they should attain to the intuition of God, and thereby to immutability in goodness."[6] We shall not fail to see, when we come to look more closely into the systematic connection of the doctrines of these theologians, that a twofold application of the term *gratia* lay at the bottom, in the case of them all. The rational creature is equally dependent on God with all the other creatures; his universal coöperation is indispensable, without which even the powers originally implanted in the creatures could not continue to exist and operate. But from this is to be distinguished a new communication of God to his rational creatures, supervening to the original

[1] Potestas peccandi, quae addita voluntati, minuit ejus libertatem, et si dematur, auget, nec libertas est nec pars libertatis. In his dialogue, De libero arbitrio, c. i.

[2] Ad servandam acceptam rectitudinem voluntatis propter seipsam.

[3] Plus aliquid, quam acceperat, inordinate volendo voluit inordinate similis esse Deo. See the tract, De casu Diaboli.

[4] Anselm himself avows his ignorance with regard to this higher stage that Satan would have attained to by his *selfwill*; and which *they* obtain by *humble submission* to the divine will. The words of the master: Quid illud fuerit non video, sed quicquid fuerit, sufficit scire, quia fuit aliquid, ad quod crescere potuerunt, quod non acceperunt, quando creati sunt, ut ad illud suo merito proficerent, c. vi.

[5] Primus homo hac vi floruit, pronus velle bona et quae voluerit nullo obnitente relinquens infecta, talis ex creationis natura ita tamen, ut nihil queat absque coöperante gratia, p. ii, c. iv.

[6] Lib. ii, c. v.

powers, and made conditional on the employment of them,— a communication which they need in order to reach their ultimate destination. This distinction, already lying at bottom in the previous dogmatic systems, would therefore, when once clearly brought out, be generally recognized. It was so brought out by Hugo a St. Victore. He distinguishes grace, for instance, in the wider sense, as denoting the universal divine influence (*concursus*) on which all creaturely action constantly depends,— without which the powers originally bestowed on rational creatures cannot operate,— and grace, in the more restricted sense, as something supervening to those original powers of nature through a new divine communication, whereby they are exalted. This distinction having been once clearly expressed, the question next arose, For what, in man's primitive state, did grace, in the wider sense, suffice ; and for what did he need grace, in the more restricted sense ? Hugo answered :[1] " The former sufficed to keep man from falling, with his free will, from the position where he was placed by the original constitution of his nature. But to actual righteousness, the actual accomplishment of good works and progress therein, he could not attain without some new supervening grace.[2] Before sin, man was able by his free will, with the assistance of that common grace, to avoid evil ; but he needed *gratia coöperans*, in order to perform anything positively good. But after the fall, he needed not only *gratia coöperans*, but also *gratia operans*." Peter Lombard attributes to the first man a free will wholly uncorrupt, and all the natural powers of the soul in their full purity and vigor.[3] This freewill wills that which is good, but after a feeble manner, until the help of divine grace supervenes, by which first the *efficaciter velle* is imparted to it. Peter of Poictiers[4] makes the image of God refer to those spiritual powers bestowed on man at creation, by the right use of which he might have attained to the realization of likeness to God. But in order to this it was necessary, in his opinion, that the *bona gratuita* should supervene to the *bonis naturalibus*.[5] Man was created for likeness to God, inasmuch as his spiritual nature was so constituted as to render him capable of receiving those higher goods, and of forming himself to the virtues proceeding therefrom.[6] He distinguishes in the primeval state two conditions, one before and the other after the bestowment of grace.[7]

This distinction of natural and supernatural, applied to man's origi-

[1] Summa Sentent. tract. iii, c. vii.

[2] Sine apposita gratia.

[3] Lib. ii, Distinct. xxiv : Libertas arbitrii ab omni labe et corruptela immunis atque voluntatis rectitudo et omnium naturalium potentiarum animae sinceritas atque vivacitas.

[4] P. ii, c. ix, Sentent.

[5] Also, the mystical theologian, abbot Rupert of Deutz (Tuitiensis), bears testimony to this distinction, which was still further prosecuted by the speculative theologians, as one grounded in the universal consciousness of the church, since he remarks : Cum creasset Deus ad imaginem suam hominem, coepit illum informare ad *similitudinem* suam. Non enim creando, sed *informando* perducit Deus hominem ad similitudinem suam. De victoria verbi Dei lib. ii, c. vii.

[6] Ad habilitatem suscipiendi bona gratuita, quia factus est aptus suscipere virtutes, non tamen statim habuit.

[7] Duo status, unus, in quo non habuit gratiam, qua posset proficere, et alius, qui habuit gratiam, qua potuit proficere.

nal state, was attended, indeed, with the advantage that the supernaturalistic element in the system of faith, and opposition to Pelagianism were thus made to rest on deeper grounds; but it might also be attended with a disadvantage in furnishing encouragement and the occasion for a separation of the divine and human, altogether at variance with the essence of Christianity; as if the truly human could subsist wholly separate from all union with God, and the divine, the supernatural first supervened from without, as something that did not belong to the actualization of the essence of human nature; under which supposition, redemption could not be apprehended in its right relation to human nature, as the restoration of that nature. This mistake had an important influence also on the systems of morals; for it led men to apprehend the divine, not as the ennobling of the human, and the actualization of all that which was originally implanted in man's nature, but as the superhuman. A false direction in ethics, which, as we have already been led to remark, had been transmitted from earlier centuries, was thereby kept up, and this false tendency might in turn contribute to promote the view in question. If we consider the mighty influence of Aristotle, in whose ethics this separating of the purely human and the divine — which is characteristic of the ancient morals generally — strongly predominates, it will be quite apparent to us that this influence, also, would operate powerfully in the same way. We have preferred to notice this connection beforehand, and in this place, that we may be able to refer back to it in the particular expositions which are to follow.

The abbot Peter de la Celle, afterwards bishop of Chartres, felt it to be his duty, already, to enter a firm and decided protest against the view of which we have been speaking.[1] He expressed his surprise that he must be compelled to hear, what he never could have dreamed of himself, that likeness to God was an accidental gift, when it must assuredly be known to be a quality truly essential. It appears to him that the true essence of human nature cannot be conceived, at all, separate from the divine life.[2] Should it be said, this likeness is something contingent because it may be lost, it would follow for the same reason, that life itself is something contingent to us.[3]

This separating of the purely human and the divine lies at bottom of the view of man's primeval state, in Alexander of Hales.[4] In man's original state, he looks upon the purely human (the *pura naturalia*), as the first; the divine, he considers as something superinduced at a later period, for the ennobling of the purely human. In other words, that man was created at first in a pure state of nature left to itself (*in puris naturalibus*), he declares to be the view most conformable to reason. He distinguishes two stages of development: "It served to glorify the divine majesty, that nature should appear

[1] Lib. iii, ep. iv.

[2] Quid igitur? Itane summa illa beatitudo et gloria saeculorum accidentalis erit, ut possit adesse et abesse praeter subjecti corruptionem?

[3] Vera quoque virtus, vera bonitas, vera justitia, imo ipsa veritas est Deus. Sine his igitur si fuerit anima, moritur, et dicis esse accidentalia dona?

[4] P. i, Quaest. xcvi

first, in its development out of itself; and that the higher formation (*informatio*) by grace, should then be communicated to it, in order that man might be led to the sense of what grace is, as a gift of God; might be taught to distinguish such effects as proceed from this, the supernatural, from the barely natural. There is a manifestation of divine wisdom in the way in which man is conducted along, through various stages of development towards perfection. The goodness of God shines forth in this, that in communicating himself to man he imparts to him not only single operations of grace, but also the capacity, in a certain sense, of independent coöperation; — the divine life considered as something independent, and animating the individuality of character. The theologians of the thirteenth century, in their conception of grace, make the important distinction between isolated effects of the divine, the supernatural, isolated notions of the higher life, particular higher gifts, and the divine life as a principle ennobling the whole individuality of character; that from which a new character proceeds,— the individual wholly interpenetrated with a divine life,— the distinction between a *gratia gratis data*, and a *gratum faciens*,— such grace as first renders the man well-pleasing to God. This perfect communication of God was to be made conditional on the right use of nature. It is a universal law that, in nature, a certain preparation and receptivity for the communication of grace is required.[1] Hence, grace was not created in man, but kept in store until, by the use of reason, he had become in a certain sense fitted for the reception of the same.[2] Merit, in the strict sense of the word, as that on the ground of which something may be claimed as a due, *a meritum de condigno*, could certainly find no place here; as must be evident, indeed, from the incommensurate relation between things divine and natural; but doubtless, there might be *a meritum de congruo* (*congruit, id quod congruit*), *α θεῖον πρέπον*, in perfect accordance with the laws of the moral order of the world, a merit constituting the condition under which God has found it befitting to bestow his grace. So here the principle already appears, that the bestowment of grace is always conditioned on the use made of it by freewill. Pure nature stood as yet in no opposition to the divine; the latter was simply *wanting* to the perfection of nature; nature was *informis negative* not *privative*. The divine found still a clear place for its action; it had as yet no opposition to overcome. Nothing was needed as yet but a *gratia informans;* no *gratia reformans*. Now as it respects the exact relation subsisting between the state of *pura naturalia* and that of *gratia*, Alexander of Hales by no means limits this first state of man to his ethical position. The purely human is to him by no means the merely moral part of man's nature: for he assumes the relation to God as one implanted originally in human nature. This relation, grounded in the very essence of the creature, as such, must reveal itself in man as simply

[1] Deus secundum legem communem requirit aliquam praeparationem et dispositionem ex parte naturae ad hoc, ut infundat alicui gratiam.

[2] Deus liberalis salvo ordine sapientiae et justitiae.

conscious of himself. Accordingly, love to God, as the creature's highest good was necessarily present in the state of pure nature. But he distinguishes from this purely *human* virtue a *superhuman* one. In the purely human, according to him, something selfish still seems to inhere, which could only be removed by a higher principle. From the above-mentioned love to God as the creature's highest good, belonging to the pure state of nature, Alexander distinguishes a still higher position of love, standing in contradiction with the natural inclinations, which impels a man to do, for God's sake, that to which the natural inclinations are adverse; or to shun that which is the object of natural love; as that love to God which leads men to love their enemies and to despise all earthly goods. This is the supernatural disposition of "charity." Here again that *ethical* direction is the principle lying at bottom, which proposes not the appropriation of the earthly in subservience to the divine, but the utter renunciation of the earthly, as the highest problem; a view which stands closely connected with the above-mentioned false separation of the divine and human.

According to the teachings of this theology, all communication of God to man is conditioned on a certain preparation on man's part, a certain "merit." But now it is inseparably connected with the above view of the relation of the human to the divine, that eternal happiness must be regarded as something far transcending the *pura naturalia*, as well as everything barely creaturely, so that no proportionality can exist between them. In the condition of *pura naturalia*, therefore, no "merit," by which man could have made himself worthy of that happiness, was possible. It required a supernatural mediation, in order that man might be fitted for that supernatural eternal life.[1] To the supernatural divine, nothing corresponds but the supernatural divine. A proportionality can exist only between a supernatural divine life bestowed on man already in the present life, and eternal blessedness.[2]

Bonaventura defines the place assigned to man as the image of God in the creation in accordance with his doctrine already explained concerning the end of the creation.[3] God created all things for his own glory; — as the greatest light, for his own self-manifestation; as supreme goodness, for his own self-communication. But there can be no perfect revelation without some one to understand it,— no perfect communication of goodness, without some one capable of enjoying it. Since this capacity of understanding and enjoyment belongs only to the rational creatures, the irrational creation stands in no immediate, but only in an indirect relation to God; and that, through the medium of the rational creature.[4] But rational creatures, being created to praise and to know God, and to appropriate other things for the use of a will in submission to God, are therefore created to stand in an immediate relation to God (*nata est ordinari in Deum immediate*).

[1] Ipsius gratuitae bonitatis influentia, per quam creatori ipsi creatura grata existat, gratia gratum faciens.

[2] Impossibile, quod homo merendo ad illud summum bonum ascendat, nisi per aliquod adjutorium, quod sit ultra naturam.

[3] Lib. ii, Distinct. xvi, Quaest. i.

[4] Non habent ipsae creaturae irrationales immediate ad Deum ordinari, sed mediante creatura rationali.

By virtue of this immediate relation to God, they are capable of communion with God, and God can hold communion with them (*ideo capax ejus est vel e converso*). Therefore they are destined to become like him; and they carry within them, from the beginning, the light of God's countenance.[1] Because the rational creature is in a certain sense all things, and is so created as to embrace within himself the images of all things, as to receive all things into himself intellectually, therefore may it be said, that as the universe represents God in a sensuous, so the rational creature represents him in an intellectual totality.[2] Bonaventura also adopts the above-mentioned distinction between the image of God, and likeness to God. The former, he refers more particularly to intellectual qualities;[3] the latter, to the heart or feelings, the bent of the will, from which proceeds love to God, the means above all others whereby man becomes like him.[4] The "intellect" should therefore be governed by the "affections." He recognizes, it is true, in the original pure nature, an aptitude for blessedness;[5] but he supposes, that in order to an *actual* receptivity for it, a supernatural medium is required, a supernatural faculty must be bestowed on man.[6] The distinction here explained of a twofold meaning of grace (*gratia*), the inworking of God by means of the natural chain of causes and effects, and the supernatural operation by which nature is provided with new and higher powers,[7] of a twofold love to God, that grounded in the natural relation of the creature to God as the highest good and end of the creation, and a supernatural love required as the means to the supernatural end,[8] — this distinction also passed over to the great teachers of the following age.

But what constitutes the peculiar feature of the doctrine of Thomas as compared with that of Alexander of Hales, and forms an important moment, on account of its bearing on the gradually-developed difference in the theology of the two monkish orders, is, that the former did not suppose in man's original state two conditions, or positions, separated from each other in the order of time, the first, that of the *pura naturalia*, left to itself, the second, that where "grace" was bestowed on man, in consideration of his faithful employment of the *pura naturalia;*

[1] Propter hoc fert in se a sua origine lumen vultus divini.

[2] Quia rationalis creatura et intellectus quodam modo est omnia, et omnia nata sunt ibi scribi et imprimi omniumque similitudines depingi, ideo, sicut totum universum repraesentat Deum in quadam totalitate sensibili, sic creatura rationalis eum repraesentat in quadam totalitate spirituali, nata alia in se spiritualiter continere.

[3] Virtus cognitiva, potentia cognoscendi.

[4] Virtus affectiva, potentia diligendi, qualitas in qua principaliter assimilatur anima Deo, est in voluntate sive affectione.

[5] The aptitudo.

[6] The dispositio sufficiens et propinqua, sufficiens ordo ad actum, Distinct. 19, Artic. iii, Quaest. i.

[7] As Thomas Aquinas expresses himself, the divinum adjutorium, sine quo nec lapis in esse conservaretur nec deorsum tenderet, similiter etiam nec humana natura sine eo vel consistere potest vel rectum motum voluntatis habere, and the donum naturalibus superadditum.

[8] In the words of Thomas, the principle: Nulla creatura rationalis potest habere motum voluntatis ordinatum ad illam beatitudinem, nisi mota a supernaturali agente, i. e. auxilium gratiae. The distinction between the naturaliter diligere Deum, in quantum est principium naturalis esse and the conversio ad Deum, in quantum est beatificans per suae essentiae visionem.

but taught that both the pure moral nature and the supernatural state of grace, were, from the first, harmoniously united, and must cöoperate together, in order to produce original righteousness (*originalis justitia*); so that no other distinction could be applied here than a distinction in thought.[1] This difference immediately brought along with it other differences in the doctrine concerning the relation of free-will to grace. In his *Summa*,[2] Thomas thinks he can thus prove the doctrine of a concreated state of grace. Belonging to the state of original purity or uprightness, in which man was created,[3] was the harmony subsisting in man's entire nature; the body obeyed the soul; the lower powers of the soul, reason; and the latter was obedient to God. Now this harmonious relation between reason and God, is the ground of all other harmony in human nature. But this harmony between the higher and lower powers was disturbed by sin; it was not a condition, therefore, grounded in the essence of human nature as such. Arguing from the effect to the cause, then, we may conclude that this harmonious relation between reason and God proceeded from grace bestowed on man. In his commentary on the Sentences,[4] he also explains himself, it is true, after precisely the same manner, on the conflict between the two views above mentioned; but in such way as to avoid all decisive expression of an opinion; remarking that here, as in all matters depending on the will of God, nothing could be decided with perfect assurance.[5] He lays it down as the most probable opinion (*probabilius*), that man was created in the state of pure nature, and as his powers could not remain inactive, he, from the first moment of his creation, turned to God, and attained to grace.[6] Among the objections to this supposition, Thomas cites the passage, which also in later times, has been cited to prove that a foundation or aptitude (*Anlage*) for sin existed in the first man, 1 Corinth. 15 : 46;[7] in reply to which he remarks, that this passage refers to the constitution of the body, not to that of the soul.[8]

Augustin, having already explained to himself the influence and effects of the first sin according to his philosophical system of Realism, was followed in this by the representatives of the same philosophical sect, in the twelfth century. It is the doctrine of Anselm of Canterbury, that as entire human nature was only expressed and contained, as yet, in this first exemplar, entire humanity, therefore, became corrupt in him, and the corruption passed from him to his posterity,

[1] As he himself describes it in lib. ii, Sententiar. Distinct. 29, Quaest. i, Artic. ii: Secundum ordinem naturae status in naturalibus puris ad statum ejus in gratia comparatur et non secundum ordinem temporis.

[2] P. i, Qu. xcv, Art. i.

[3] The rectitudo primi status, according to the preacher, Eccles. 7 : 29.

[4] In lib. ii, Dist. 29, Qu. 1, Art. ii.

[5] Quae harum opinionum verior sit, multum efficaci ratione probari non potest, sicut nec aliquid eorum, quae ex voluntate Dei sola pendent.

[6] Cum homo creatus fuerit in naturalibus integris, quae otiosa esse non poterant, in primo instanti creationis ad Deum conversus, gratiam consecutus.

[7] Sed vivificatio spiritus est per gratiam, ergo hoc est proprium Christi, quod fuerit factus in gratia.

[8] Non ergo in verbis Apostoli habetur, quod Adam non fuit spiritualis secundum animam, sed quod non fuit spiritualis secundum corpus.

just as his moral character, if he had remained obedient to the divine will, would have been transmitted to all.[1] He therefore distinguishes *peccatum naturale* from *peccatum personale*, — the former being so called, — not as though it were grounded in the essence of the nature, but because it goes with it on account of the corruption of that nature.[2] This connection of ideas is exhibited with remarkable distinctness in the work which Odo of Tournay, the person whose change from a philosopher to a theologian we have described on a former page, has written on this doctrine.[3]

In the Anthropology of Abelard, we find the same unsettled conflict between contending elements, which is so apparent everywhere in his theology, the conflict between the subjective bent of his mind, as it had developed itself out of the man, and the force of the church doctrine pressing upon him from without. What he has thrown out here and there on this doctrine in his works on theology,[4] in his *Scito te ipsum*, and in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, certainly cannot be joined together in a logically coherent system; and he himself was compelled to resort to far-fetched expedients, which could not possibly satisfy any thinking mind, in order to avoid contradictions, which he could not conceal from himself. In his literal understanding of the facts related in Genesis, he agreed with Augustin and Pelagius, in the isolated, empirical, and abstract views of the understanding which he followed, we see the spirit of Pelagius, rather than that of Augustin. Considered from this point of view, it could not appear so very grave a fault to him, that the first man, inexperienced in moral conflicts, by giving way to the enticements of sensual appetite, which in itself considered was an innocent thing, should be betrayed into transgression of the divine law, on the first trial to which he was exposed. And the more inclined he was to think lightly of the intrinsic importance of this act, the more abhorrent was it to his reason to derive from it so great and general a consequence as that all men must thereby be liable to condemnation.[5] When he went on the principle, that a violation of the divine law, such at least as had been owing to an inculpable ignorance, could not be imputed as sin, when he considered the opposition between reason and sense as belonging necessarily to the organism of human nature, and conflict as something required, in order to the realization of virtue, it is easy to see, that from these premises followed conclusions which must lead to an entirely different view of man's original state, and of the first sin, from that held by Augustin and the church. Hence, too, he was inclined to interpret the passage in Romans, 5 : 12 (the *in quo*, which, following the authority of Augustin, theologians were

[1] Humana natura, quae sic erat in Adam tota, ut nihil de illa extra illum esset.

[2] Quoniam propter ejus corruptionem cum illa assumitur.

[3] De peccato originali libri tres.

[4] In a copy of the lectures published by Prof. Rheinwald, this doctrine is not touched at all.

[5] Unum delictum nec magnum aliorum comparatione in ep. ad Roman. lib. ii, p. 588. Quantum sit crudele et summae bonitati Dei incongruum, qui salvare magis quam perdere animas desiderat, ut pro peccato parentis filium damnet, quem pro ejus minime justitia salvaret.

accustomed to explain as relating to a transfer of Adam's guilt to all his posterity), as meaning simply, that the punishment of Adam's sin had passed upon all;[1] in defending which interpretation, he maintained that the term sin was used metonymically, the punishment of sin only being intended by it.[2] But on the other hand, he remained bound under the fetters of the church system. He could not cast off the theory, that all continued subject to those punishments that had passed upon them from Adam; and, indeed, in order to free himself from it, it would have been necessary for him to assume an entirely different position towards the church doctrine of his time, and to make a far more thorough and resolute application of the thoughts which he had expressed. But resolved as he was to hold fast on the above determinations of the church doctrine, while at the same time he refused to acknowledge the common doctrine concerning original guilt and original sin,[3] it could not be otherwise than that, from his own point of view (which would not allow him to acknowledge the mysterious connection between the development of the entire race and original sin), God must appear only so much the more as a being who acted arbitrarily and unjustly. Thus he was driven from rationalism to the most abrupt supernaturalism, falling back as the last resort upon the unlimited will of the Creator, who may dispose of his creatures according to his own pleasure. He thinks that those who are punished without any guilt of their own, can no more complain, than the brutes, which God has appointed for the service of man, can enter into judgment with him. He goes to the extreme of making the distinction of right and wrong to depend on the divine will;[4] a representation which, it is evident, directly contradicts his doctrine of God's omnipotence, explained on a former page. But he turns about again, and attempts to justify, though in a very unsatisfactory manner, the goodness of God in proceeding after this manner. Children which suffer solely on account of the first sin, which remain excluded from baptism, would only be punished in the mildest way, in a degree suited to their condition, in not being suffered ever to attain to the intuition of God. And God would so order events, that those children only would be subjected to this lot, and die unbaptized, which, had they lived longer, would, by their offences and crimes, have brought upon themselves a severer punishment; so that, in comparison with this latter, the lot which they actually meet with is rather a mitigation of their doom. Abelard says that, by suspending so severe a punishment on account of so trifling a sin, over a posterity not guilty on their own account, God designed to express his abhorrence of all sin.[5] Thus could he unite a way of

[1] Poenam peccati incurrerunt in ep. ad Roman. lib. ii, p. 586.

[2] L. c. p. 591.

[3] Accordingly he says, that the assertion, the children sinned in Adam, is to be understood in an improper sense; as when we say in the improper sense, that a tyrant still lives in his children. L. c. p. 597.

[4] Hac ratione profiteor, quoquomodo Deus creaturam suam tractare velit, nullius injuriae potest argui. Nec malum aliquomodo potest dici, quod juxta ejus voluntatem fiat. Non enim aliter bonum a malo discernere possumus, nisi quod ejus est consentaneum voluntati et in placito ejus consistit. Lib. ii, p. 595.

[5] Voluit etiam ostendere in prima et fortasse modica primorum parentum trans-

thinking which was in many respects altogether rationalistic, with a subjugation of reason under the yoke of a blind and implicit faith. For the rest, those peculiar opinions of his on the subject of original sin belonged, as we see from Bernard's tract against him, with the other censurable things which his adversaries found in his writings He was obliged, therefore, to take notice of them in his Apology; but his explanations on these points are extremely indefinite, and by no means contain an unreserved confirmation of the church doctrine, since he gives no further account of the propagation of sin and punishment from Adam, than by saying that his sin was the origin and cause of all the other sins that followed;[1] and it is very apparent from the manner in which he expresses himself concerning sins of ignorance that he was extremely reluctant to allow that the divine imputation would be extended to any other sins of ignorance than those of culpable ignorance; for what other reason had he for adding the qualifying word "especially."[2]

After the separation of goodness of nature and of grace, *bona naturalia* and *gratuita*, in man's original state, had become more clearly expressed, the explication of the doctrine of original sin would be determined accordingly. Thus, Peter Lombard teaches, that man was not deprived of natural goodness, but this goodness was corrupted; for, had the former been the case, no possibility of reformation would have been left. But supernatural goodness was wholly removed from him.[3]

Thomas Aquinas declares, it is true, against Traducianism; at the same time, however, he says, all the descendants of Adam are to be considered as one man, by reason of the community of nature received from the father of the race. Original sin, he calls a disorderly condition (*inordinata dispositio*), which originated in the dissolution of that harmony, in which consisted the essence of original righteousness, the disorder of nature (*languor naturae*). Negatively, it is the deprivation of original righteousness; positively, the disorderly relation of the parts of the soul to each other (*inordinata dispositio partium animae*).

In the doctrine concerning Christ, the question was first started in the twelfth century, whether we should conceive of his sinlessness as a *posse non peccare*, or a *non posse peccare*, the former having been the opinion of Theodore of Mopsuestia; the latter, that of Augustin. Anselm[4] says, "Christ could have sinned, had he willed to; but he could not will to sin. Such a will would have stood in contradiction with his holiness. There was a moral necessity in the nature of the God-man, which does not exclude freedom." In Abelard, we may observe also on this point the same twofold bent which has just before been alluded to. The rational element made him inclined to illustrate the union of

gressione, quam ita in posteris, nihil adhuc merentibus, vindicat, quantum omnem abhorret iniquitatem et quantum poenam majoribus culpis et frequentioribus reservet, si hoc semel commissum in unius pomi reparabilis esu ita in posteris punire non differat. Lib. ii, p. 596.

[1] Ex Adam, in quo omnes peccaverunt, tam culpam quam poenam nos contraxisse assero.

[2] See above, p. 493.

[3] Naturalia bona non detracta sed corrupta, gratuita detracta.

[4] Cur Deus homo, lib. ii. c. x.

God with humanity in Christ by an analogy long before used, *that* union with God which was vouchsafed to holy enlightened men and prophets. What was a transient and fragmentary thing in their case, they being sometimes filled, at others forsaken, by the Spirit of God,[1] this was an entire and constant union in the case of Christ alone, like the union betwixt soul and body. As all motions of the body proceed from the soul, so the soul of Christ could impart no other motions to his body than those inspired in it by the word."[2] Accordingly, it was an important point with him to give prominence to the purely human element in Christ, so as to keep clear of all Docetic illusions. He supposes that as freewill, and therefore the capability of sinning or not sinning, belong to the essence of human nature, so we may venture to ascribe to the man in Christ also, abstractly considered (*in abstracto*), only the *posse non peccare*. By a *non posse peccare* we should destroy the essence of virtue, which is grounded in freewill.[3] In so far, then, as we contemplate this man as subsisting, independently for himself, we must also suppose in him the possibility of sinning. But it is quite another thing, when we conceive of the man as one united with God; and when we speak of Christ as of one in whom deity and humanity are united, we can but predicate of him absolutely the impossibility of sinning. In opposition to some exaggerated statements of eminent ancient fathers, he affirms that what is related concerning the conflicts of Christ in view of death, the feeling of sadness, his human weakness, is to be understood in the proper sense. Even the authority of Augustin could not shake his conviction on this point. "Let Augustin say what he will," he remarks, "we affirm that as Christ took on him true humanity, so too he had the real defects of human weakness."[4] Hugo a St. Victore and Peter Lombard, on the other hand, seek to reconcile the opposite declarations of the church fathers by distinguishing from one another the different kinds of weakness, the purely human, the natural, and those connected with sin. Hugo a St. Victore says: "There is a moderated fear, which dwells in every man and is without sin, like hunger and thirst;" he means that connected with the natural instinct of self-preservation, the shrinking of the natural feelings from death. "This we may suppose to have been in Christ." Peter Lombard distinguishes from a passion, by which the mind may be affected in an extraordinary manner and drawn away from the right course, another which cannot draw it away from the contempla-

[1] Which perfectly accords with his doctrine of inspiration, as explained on a former page.

[2] Sententiae, c. xxiv.

[3] Si simpliciter dicitur, hominem illum, qui unitus est, nullo modo peccare posse, potest quilibet ambigere. Si enim peccare non potest, quod meritum habet, cavendo peccatum, quod nullatenus incurrere potest? Christus libero videtur privatus arbitrio et necessitate potius quam voluntate peccatum cavere. — Quis etiam neget hominem illum, qui Deo unitus est, etiam sine illa unione, sicut caeteros homines in sua natura consistere posse? Alioquin minoris valetudinis esse videretur, si per se ipse subsistere non posset, non [here, beyond doubt, there is some mistake in the reading, it should read nam] et magis accidentis, quam substantiae naturam habere. Ep. ad Roman. lib. i, p. 538 et 539.

[4] Dicat Augustinus voluntatem suam, nos vero dicimus, quia, sicut veram humanitatem assumsit, ita humanae infirmitatis veros defectus habuerit. Sentent c. xxv.

tion of God, and from that which is right. The former he calls *propassio;* the latter *passio,* — a distinction which might have proved of some importance in morals.

The arriving at a distinct conception of the way in which the salvation of mankind was wrought out by Christ, was a matter on which little attention had thus far been bestowed, in comparison with the investigations on other subjects belonging to the system of faith. Though the whole of that which from this period onward was, for the first time, more sharply defined in the explication of conceptions, admits of being already pointed out, in its germ and principle, in the foundation of Christian consciousness, as it is presented to us in the declarations of the earlier church-teachers, yet everything was as yet quite indistinct and fluxive, as it is wont to be where the language of feeling predominates. Things connected in the feelings were not as yet separated and held apart in conceptions. And as the second period furnished in this respect nothing that was peculiarly new, we have scarcely touched upon this subject in tracing the development of doctrines in it. The twelfth century constitutes an epoch in the history of this doctrine; and on this account we shall state in connection with what is here to be mentioned some things that belong to an earlier century. As the scholastic theology attached itself, generally, to Augustin, and we find in him the germinal ideas out of which it proceeded, so it may be shown that this holds good also with respect to the doctrine in question. On the subject of reconciliation, Augustin is on his guard against an anthropopathical misconception that might easily arise, if one were not careful to separate the idea lying at bottom, the objective reality from the symbolical form of expression. "We must not so conceive," says he,[1] "the reconciliation of man, as if God required blood in order to forgive men; but we should understand it in the sense that God loved men before the creation of the world, and his love was the very cause of his sending his Son into the world: "Not as though God now first began to love those whom he before hated, as an enemy becomes reconciled with his enemy, but we are reconciled with him who already loved us, with him whose enemies *we* were by transgression."[2] Thus, Augustin perceives in this idea of reconciliation a subjective element, and yet at the same time its foundation in something possessing objective reality. He was also the first to consider the question respecting the necessity of a redemption in precisely this form. He started the query, whether any other way would have been possible; and, considered from the point of view of the divine omnipotence, he believed the answer must be in the affirmative. But no other way, he supposed, would have been so well adapted for man's recovery from his wretched condition; and this conclusion he derived, not from the intrinsic nature of the case, not from the laws of the moral government of the world, but from the subjective influences thereby to be

[1] De trinitate, lib. xiii, c. xi, § 15.

[2] Quod ergo reconciliati sumus Deo per mortem filii ejus non sic audiatur, ut jam inciperet amare quos oderat, sicut reconciliatur inimicus inimico, ut deinde sint amici, sed jam nos diligenti reconciliati sumus, cum quo propter peccata inimicitiam habebamus. In Joann. Tract. cx, § 6.

produced, from the relation of this method to the affections, to the religious need implanted in man's heart; for nothing was so directly calculated to awaken its hopes, as the way in which God here manifested his love, which could be done by no act so effectually, as by his entering into union with human nature."[1]

Anselm of Canterbury was the first who sought to demonstrate the necessity of the work of redemption wrought precisely in this way by the incarnation of God and the sufferings of the God-man, on rational grounds.[2] It is evident from his remarks, that at that period not only theologians, but also simple laymen (a proof of the more general habit of reflection on religious subjects) employed their thoughts a good deal on the question, why God might not have forgiven men by a simple act of his will, why he might not have wrought out the redemption of mankind by some angel or man.[3] With the more profound apprehension of the nature of sin, is connected in Anselm's mind a more profound apprehension of the idea of punishment and of the divine justice; a fact which becomes particularly manifest when we compare him with those who, as the older Alexandrians, resolve the idea of punitive justice into that of disciplinary love, and apprehend punishment simply as a means, and not according to its true conception and essence. "The honor due to God" — from this point he starts — "consists in this, that the creaturely will should submit itself to the divine will. Only *such* a creaturely will performs works acceptable to God, if it can act; and if it cannot do so, it is acceptable to God in itself." Now, since in every sin, God is deprived of this honor, which is his due,[4] all sin is therefore sin against God; it is impossible that the matter of it should here make any difference. Now punishment and sin appear to him to be necessarily correlative ideas. Punishment is required in order to exhibit sin in the moral government of the world in its objective significance, to mark a standing distinction in the sight of God between that which is sin and not sin.[5] The punishment of sin is necessary in order that its due place may be assigned to it in the moral government of God.[6] He endeavors to show that all conception of punishment, even in civil relations, goes back to the conception of punishment grounded in the essence of divine justice.[7] "Rather should the universe fall in ruins, than that the least thing should be done against the will of God. A substitute for the punishment required by the law can only be a satisfaction furnished therefor, when something is afforded for indemnification which outweighs the offence;[8] as, for example, when one man has wounded another, it is not a sufficient reparation to see that the wound is healed, but there

[1] De trinitate, lib. xiii, c. x, § 13.

[2] See the two books composed in the form of dialogues: Cur Deus homo and De conceptu virginali et originali peccato.

[3] In the book, Cur Deus homo. lib. i, c. i: De quaestione non solum literati, sed etiam illiterati multi quaerunt ac rationem ejus desiderant.

[4] In every sin Deo non reddere debitum.

[5] Si peccatum dimittitur impunitum, similiter erit apud Deum peccanti et non peccanti.

[6] Nihil aliud, quam recte ordinare peccatum.

[7] Deum vero non decet aliquid inordinatum in suo regno dimittere.

[8] Pro contumelia illata plus reddere, quam abstulit.

must also be added a satisfaction for the pain endured. Man being impure, was unfit to enter into the community of the holy and blessed As blessedness is that full satisfaction which excludes every want, so it is due to none but him who possesses pure righteousness."[1] Anselm now seeks to show, that no man was in a condition to afford that satisfaction for sin, required by the moral government of the world. The way in which he does this, evidences the purity and severity of his standard of morals, and proves how far he was from holding to an ascetical work-holiness. For the purpose of laying open the insufficiency of all good works, he represents the other party as saying, "Do I not honor God, when in the fear and love of God, and contrition of heart, I renounce all earthly enjoyments, in abstinence and labor deny myself the comforts of this life, and am ready to communicate to all men, to forgive, to obey God in all things?" And he answers: "Even if a man refrained wholly from sin, he would in all this be only doing his duty. But at present he is not capable even of that; and his inability is still no excuse, since this very inability is his fault. Now, as sin proceeded from one man, so must satisfaction for all proceed also from one. Such a being must have something exalted above the whole creation which he can freely offer to God, if the satisfaction is to be complete. He must have been God, therefore; but the satisfaction should be furnished by a man, because otherwise it could not be given for men; he must therefore have been a God-man, whose life as such, as infinitely exalted above the whole creation, possessed an infinite value. He voluntarily surrendered himself to a death to which he was not subject on account of sin."

Noticeable, withal, is the way in which Anselm distinguishes and separates the ethical significance of the death of Christ from the doctrinal, and contemplates the death of Christ, in the first-mentioned point of view, as a result brought about by his whole activity in his vocation. "We should be careful to distinguish," says he, "what Christ did because obedience to God required it, and what he endured as a lot brought upon him by the obedience which he showed, while at the same time it was not necessary in order to the showing of that obedience. His perfect obedience to God he manifested in continuing steadfastly true to righteousness; and the natural consequence was that the Jews plotted against him the death to which he freely offered himself.[2] Thus it clearly appears how the satisfying power of Christ's death by no means involves in it that he sought death, or that God required the death of an innocent person." Christ's victory over Satan in the severest temptations, Anselm contrasts with the sin of our first parents, who so easily gave way to the impulses of appetite. God owed him a recompense for this; but being all-sufficient in himself, no such recompense could be given him, Christ could only transfer it to

[1] Quemadmodum beatitudo sufficientia est, in qua est nulla indigentia, ita nulli convenit, nisi in quo pura est justitia.

[2] Ipse sponte sustinuit mortem, non per obedientiam deserendi vitam, sed propter obedientiam servandi justitiam, in qua tam fortiter perseveravit, ut inde mortem incurreret.

others. His life and his death contain infinitely more than is requisite to give satisfaction for all the sins in the world. It is clear from this exposition, that Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction certainly included in it the idea of a *satisfactio activa*, the idea of perfect obedience which was required in order to satisfaction for sin, and which Christ alone was able to afford. To the significance of Christ's offering in the sight of God, necessarily belonged also the moral worth of the same.[1] Far from Anselm, however, was the idea of a passive obedience, the idea of a satisfaction by suffering, of an expiation by assuming the punishment for mankind; for the satisfaction which Christ afforded by what he did was certainly, according to Anselm's doctrine, to be the restoration of God's honor, violated by sin, and by just this satisfaction afforded to God for mankind was the remission of punishment to be made possible. How far from him was that idea of a *satisfactio passiva*, appears evident also from the circumstance, that he does not seek at all to give prominence to the unhappiness of Christ in his passion, but rather to show that, amidst all his sufferings, he still was not unhappy. "In like manner," says he, "as happiness is not promoted by any agreeable thing which happens to one contrary to his wishes, so it is not to be called unhappiness when one, after wise deliberation, not forced by any necessity, but with freewill, undertakes something disagreeable." Another reason which he considers a valid one, why the God-man alone should be the redeemer of mankind, is, that man could not otherwise have attained to the possession of his dignity, but would have been made dependent on a creature.

Another characteristic in Anselm is, that he seems fully aware how the fact will not pass into any conception. "Many other considerations," says he, "conspire to show that this was very befitting, which may be more easily and clearly seen in the life of Christ and his works, than by mere arguments of reason."[2] "Who can fully explain how necessary and conformable to divine wisdom it was, that our Saviour should live as a teacher among men, at the same time proving his doctrines by his conduct and presenting himself as an example to mankind. But how could he have exhibited himself as a pattern to weak mortals, that under suffering and death they should not swerve from righteousness, if he had not endured all this himself?"

It may be gathered from Anselm's representations, that this particular doctrine occupied in a special manner the thoughts of theologians and laymen in this age; and that the older view, containing truth in a mythical form, as, for example, that, in purchasing the redemption of man, Satan should have his due, could not be satisfactory to the acute dialectics of these theologians; and it served to call forth the skepticism which was now aimed against the whole doctrine of satisfaction. We here come to see the difference between Anselm, whose investigations proceeded from a childlike faith, and a profound sense of Chris-

[1] Vita ista tantum amabilis, quantum est bona.

[2] Sunt et alia multa, cur valde convenit, quae facilius et clarius in ejus vita et operibus, quam sola ratione monstrari possunt.

tian truth, and Abelard, who began with doubt, but was restrained by the power of the religious faith of his times; while Anselm, deeply sensible to the power of the work of redemption, and doubting the solidity of the foundation on which it was placed by the older writers, sought to place it on a deeper one, corresponding to his own sense of Christian truth, Abelard carried his skepticism still farther. Together with the older theory, that a redemption so wrought out was necessary in itself, he rejected every other way of accounting for it, although he recognized, in the mission of Christ and his passion, a manifestation of the love of God with which no other could be compared. Of Anselm's deduction he seems to have known nothing. But had it been known to him, it is hardly to be supposed that a man so prevailingly bent on trying everything by the standard of the abstract understanding, would have been pleased with it.

In his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,[1] Abelard commences, in the first place, with refuting the above-mentioned older view of the necessity of such a redemption from the power of Satan. "Why might not God," says he, "by an act of his will alone, forgive men their sins, and deliver them from the power of Satan? What need was there, in order to this, of the sufferings of Christ? Christ had in fact already, before his passion, forgiven many their sins. It is not to be ascribed to any human merits, but only to the divine grace, that the Son of God assumed a human nature in union with himself, and exalted this to a perfectly sinless life; and why might not God, by virtue of the same grace, forgive the rest of mankind their sins? Why should not he, who showed so great favor to man, as to take him into this union with himself, have shown him the inferior favor of granting him the forgiveness of sins?" We see that while to Anselm, sin, in its relation to the moral government of the world, appeared something so monstrous as absolutely to require a satisfaction, Abelard was not deeply impressed with any such feelings. In particular, he was inclined, as we have already observed, to think lightly of the first sin. "How could God," he says, "become reconciled with man through the death of his Son, when this death could not happen without involving the sin of so many who crucified him, which sin was certainly far greater than the first sin, which consisted in the partaking of a forbidden apple? If God was so angry on account of that first sin, how could he be appeased in the case of so many far greater sins?[2] How unjust and cruel were it, that God should have required the blood of an innocent person as the price of pardoning so many guilty ones."[3] Abelard,

[1] Page 552.

[2] Quomodo nos reconciliari Deo per mortem filii sui dicit Apostolus, qui tanto amplius adversus hominem irasci debuit, quanto amplius homines in crucifigendo filium suum deliquerunt, quam in transgrediendo primum ejus in paridiso praeceptum, unius pomi gustu? Quo enim amplius multiplicata sunt per homines peccata, irasci Deum hominibus amplius justum fuerat. Quodsi tantum fuerat illud Adae peccatum, ut expiari non posset, nisi per mortem Christi, quam expiationem habebit ipsum homicidium, quod in Christum commissum est, tot et tanta scelera, in ipsum vel in suos commissa?

[3] Quam crudele et iniquum videtur, ut sanguinem innocentis in pretium aliquod quis requisierit, aut ullo modo ei placuerit, innocentem interfici, nedum Deus tam acceptam filii sui mortem habuerit, ut per ipsam universo reconciliatus sit mundo?

in thus utterly denying the necessity of a satisfaction to be furnished by Christ, looked, on the other hand, upon the incarnation and passion of the Son of God, as simply a manifestation of divine love, and referred everything to the subjective impression wrought upon the minds of men by this love; for which he may have found a warrant in the notion of justification according to the common, subjective mode of apprehending it; and this theory accords, moreover, with the significance which the conception love has in Abelard's system of morality. The justification and reconciliation with God, brought about through Christ's blood, he explains, in the passage alluded to, as follows: "The amazing grace shown us by God, who gave his own Son to become man and suffer for us, must enkindle in us such love in return, as to make us ready to endure all suffering for his sake." Justification consists, then, in his view, in the true righteousness begotten by this love becoming an active principle in the human soul. "Every person becomes more just, that is, more full of love to God, after the sufferings of Christ than before them, because every one is more inflamed with love by benefits bestowed than by those hoped for."[1] After the same subjective manner he apprehends also the idea of redemption. "Redemption is that greatest love enkindled in us by Christ's passion, — a love which not only delivers us from the bondage of sin, but also acquires for us the true freedom of God's children, where love instead of fear becomes the ruling affection."[2] To enkindle the flame of a love prepared to make any sacrifice, Abelard often declares to be the highest purpose of the work of Christ. It is a favorite thought of his, that the fire which Christ came to enkindle on earth, was the love shed abroad by the Holy Ghost.[3] "Because the entire life of Christ, with his miracles, was directed, till his glorification, to the great end of enlightening and instructing, and of exciting to love by instruction and manifestation of the love of God, for this reason it was particularly the Wisdom of God that must assume human nature."[4] Accordingly, it ever continued to be the firm persuasion of Abelard, that the incarnation and passion of the Son of God, was to serve the purpose of enkindling love in the human heart by the display of the greatest love of God. On this point he expressed himself in the most emphatic terms, in his lectures.[5] He here explains the term "ransom," as one used in the way of comparison.[6] "God," said he, "might have done it in many other ways, but in no way so befitting." Conformably to his doctrine of omnipotence, this was the best way; hence, too, the one which must actually be chosen.[7] Afterwards, when objections

[1] Justior, i. e. amplius Deum diligens quisque sit post passionem Christi quam ante, quia amplius in amorem accenditur completis beneficiis quam speratis.

[2] So he explains Rom. 3: 25, propter remissionem (*παρεσιν*) ut per hanc justitiam, i. e. caritatem remissionem peccatorum assequamur, p. 549.

[3] Cum ignis ipse amor dicatur, de quo veritas: ignem veni, inquit, mittere in terram, id est caritatem praedicare atque plantare, potius quam timorem, qui frigori comparatur. Theol. christian. lib. i, f. 1166, and in the Introductio, lib. ii, p. 1084, he explains the above words of Christ, by saying: amore potius quam timore corda terrena implere.

[4] Theol christian. lib. iv, f. 1308.

[5] In the Sentences, c. xxiii.

[6] Translative pretium nuncupatur.

[7] What he says, in the passage of the Sentences marked in the preceding note,

were brought against this view, he conformed himself, in his Apology, to the expressions of the church and of the Bible, without more exactly defining in what way he understood them. He designated, as the end of the incarnation, that Christ delivered us from the bondage of sin and from the yoke of Satan, and, by his death, opened for us the way to the eternal, heavenly life.

Now it was *these* peculiar doctrines of Abelard, thus unfolded, which Bernard particularly attacked, in his letter of complaint addressed to pope Innocent the Second. He charged against him that, in taking ground against that older representation of the victory of Christ over Satan, he had, with presumptuous arrogance, set his own opinion above the judgment of all the ancient church teachers;[1] and yet a church teacher of no less consideration than Anselm, had already as strenuously contended against that old representation. He accused Abelard of not acknowledging Christ as Redeemer, of saying nothing more of him than that he instructs men, by his words and example, and that he had, by his sufferings and death, exhibited before them the most perfect example of love; and the great matter of offence to his own Christian feelings was, that Christ should be considered merely as a teacher and pattern of living. "Then," exclaims he,[2] "Christ taught righteousness, but did not bestow it; he exhibited love, but did not infuse it. But the truth is, Abelard did not deny the communication of divine life by Christ. "According to Abelard's doctrine," says Bernard, "Christ would have benefited those only who could copy his life, and be inflamed with love in return for his own. But how is it with children, in whom nothing of this sort can take place?" And we must allow that here Abelard would have been unable, from his own point of view, to give any satisfactory reply. But yet, independently of this, he had asserted, although it is difficult to see how he came to ascribe this significance to the sufferings of Christ, that it was only by the sacrifice of Christ the way to the kingdom of heaven had been opened for all.[3] In relation to the question thrown out by Abelard, whether God could not have redeemed men by his simple will, Bernard replies:[4] "Who denies that other ways of redeeming, justifying, and delivering us, were possible to the Almighty; but this can make out nothing against the efficacy of the way and method which, among many, he has actually chosen." He then adduces a reason for the choice of *this* method,

doubtless has reference to this: Possibilitas tamen ista ad quid referatur, satis superque determinatum esse arbitror.

[1] In his letter. De erroribus Abaelardi, c. v. he cites such language as this from Abelard: sciendum est quod omnes doctores nostri post Apostolos in hoc conveniunt, and then: sed ut nobis videtur; and he remarks, beforehand, that he cites it as he had read it in Abelard's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, and in his book of the Sentences. But neither in that book, nor in the lectures published by Prof. Rheinwald, is any such passage to be found. In the Sentences, c. xxiii, Abelard, in mentioning the above-noticed opinion, simply says: quidam dicunt; and afterwards: ego vero e contra dico et ratione irrefragabili probo. As appears evident, this language is milder and at the same time more decided and abrupt than that quoted by Bernard. Perhaps Bernard's quotation is taken from some other lecture. For the rest, the language quoted coincides, in other respects, very nearly with what we find in the Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans.

[2] Cap. vii.

[3] See Ep. ad Rom. lib. ii, p. 563. [4] Cap. viii

which Abelard, too, might have allowed from his own point of view. "Perhaps that way and method is the best, by means of which we, in this land of forgetfulness, have most strongly and vividly brought to our remembrance our own fall, through the many and great sufferings of our Saviour." But then he adds, that the inexhaustible depth of this mystery, how it answers to the divine wisdom, what it effects for the glorifying of God and the salvation of man, it is beyond any man's power to explore. And instead of indulging in nice speculations, he chose to appeal to inward experience. "Although we cannot fathom the holy will of God, yet we can feel the effect of the work, we can be sensible of its benefit.[1] Why did he accomplish that by his blood, which he might have accomplished by a word? Ask himself. It is vouchsafed me to know that the *fact is so*, but not the *wherefore*. Shall the creature say to the Creator, Why hast thou formed me thus?" In allusion to the scruple which Abelard expressed about admitting that God required the blood of an innocent person, etc., Bernard answers: "It was not the *death* of Christ, *in itself*, but the will of him who freely offered himself, that was acceptable to God. And because this precious death, procuring the downfall of sin, could only be brought about by sin, so God had no pleasure in the sin, but used it for good. God did not require the death of his Son, but accepted it when offered; he did not thirst for blood, but for man's salvation." Bernard concludes with this remark: "Three things here meet together, the humility of self-renunciation, the manifestation of love even to the death of the cross, the mystery of redemption whereby he overcame death. The two former parts are nothing without the third. The examples of humility and love are something great, but have no firm foundation without the redemption." The copying of the humility of Christ, love to him, is nothing in his view without union with him, which first confers the power for all, and which gives eternal life. Bernard, too, gives prominence to *that end* of Christ's passion, which Abelard represents as the sole end, and expresses himself in an altogether similar manner with the latter. He brings up the question, "Could not the Creator have redeemed his creature without those conflicts of trial?" And he answers, "No doubt he could have done so, but he chose to accomplish man's redemption in this way, in order to excite him to greater love and gratitude by the sacrifice he made for him."[2] The divine and typical, in the life of Christ, is also made a matter of prominent importance by Bernard. "How fair thou appearest to me," says he, "even in my own form, Lord Jesus! not solely on account of the divine miracle, but also on account of the truth, meekness, and righteousness. Blessed is he who narrowly observeth thee, so as thou walkedst as a man among men, and, according to his ability, striveth thus to be thine imitator."[3] We have

[1] Si non licet perscrutari divinae sacramentum voluntatis, licet tamen sentire effectum operis, fructum utilitatis percipere.

[2] In Cantica Canticorum, Sermo xi, § 7.

[3] Quam formosum et in mea forma te agnosco, Domine Jesu! non ob divina tantum, quibus effulges miracula, sed et propter veritatem, et mansuetudinem et justitiam. Beatus, qui te in his hominem inter homines conversantem diligenter observans, seipsum praebet pro viribus imitatorem tui. In Cantica C. S. xxv, § 9.

already seen, on a former page,[1] how he made the chief end of the appearance of the Word in the flesh to consist in this, that the love of man might gradually emancipate itself from the things of sense to those which are purely spiritual, might elevate itself from the appearance of the divine, which lowered itself down to man in the form of the sensible life, to the divine as it is in itself.

Robert of Pullein, also, approaches nearer to Abelard than to Anselm, when he says that God might, indeed, have redeemed men in some other way, but that he chose this particular way in order to exhibit to us, in the greatness of the ransom, the greatness of his love and of our sin.[2]

As it respects Peter Lombard, it is to be noticed that, adopting as his own the words of Augustin, cited a few pages back, he is on his guard against the same anthropopathic misconception of the idea of reconciliation which Augustin thought it so important to avoid. "We must not so conceive," says he, "of the reconciliation of man with God, brought about by Christ, as if God then, for the first time, began to love those who were before objects of his hatred, as an enemy is reconciled to his enemy. God did not first begin to love us, when he became reconciled with us through the blood of his Son; but he loved us before the world was, and before we were. We were, only on account of sin, at enmity with him, who ceased not to love us, even when we were his enemies. We were at enmity with him, as sin and righteousness are at enmity." From Anselm's explication he has adopted nothing. He allows himself to be determined only by the declarations of the old church teachers, collated together, and follows, here, the evidence of authorities, rather than dialectical explication. He denominates Christ the only perfect and entirely valid sacrifice for mankind. He contrasts his self-renunciation and humility with the pride by which the first man fell. In respect of the passion, he supposes a *satisfactio vicaria*, which we do not find in Anselm. That ancient doctrine of the justice due to Satan, once more emerges in him. Yet, on the other hand, he explains the *justificatio per Christi sanguinem* to mean that men are justified, that is, made just, by the return of love which the revelation of God's love enkindles in their hearts. And to the question, Whether God could have brought about man's redemption in any other way, he answers, that some other way was, indeed, possible to God; but no other was so well fitted to raise up the souls of men and deliver them from despondency, as that God should show them such love, and consider them worthy of such amazing condescension. Neither do we meet with any trace of Anselm's explication in pope Innocent the Third. Like Peter Lombard he gives peculiar prominence to the impression which the manifestation of God's love, in the redemptive sufferings of Christ, must make, and the example of humility which he gave, as contrasted with the pride of man.[3] He is probably the first who represented the work of redemption expressly as

[1] Page 262.

[2] Ut quantitate pretii quantitatem nobis sui innotesceret amoris et nostri peccati.

[3] Ut per mortem suam genus humanum

a reconciliation between the divine mercy and justice. "God's justice," says he, "required an adequate punishment for all; his mercy could not permit this; hence the adjustment that God took upon himself the punishment for all, and bestowed the gift of salvation upon all through himself."[1] But the doctrine above mentioned, of the justice experienced by Satan, is to be met with also in him.

Thomas Aquinas adopts Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction, together with all the other points thus far developed in his representation of it. Like Anselm, he places the satisfaction furnished by Christ over against the punishments which mankind must have suffered for sin. The satisfaction consisted in this, that Christ offered something of infinite worth, something exalted above the whole creation, to God. In suffering from love and obedience, Christ offered to God something greater than was required as a satisfaction for the entire sins of mankind; first, by reason of the greatness of the love with which he suffered; then by virtue of the dignity of his life, which as the life of the God-man possessed an infinite worth; and thirdly, on account of the greatness of his sufferings. Hence, the "passion of Christ" is not only "sufficient," but also "superabundant" for the sins of all mankind. In connection with this satisfaction, Thomas now mentions also the punishment borne by Christ for mankind: "Christ must take upon himself, as he says, that punishment which is the termination of all other, which virtually contains all other in itself, that is, death.[2] But besides the deliverance of man from sin by the satisfaction furnished for him, many other things come in in addition, which make this way in which the redemption of man was accomplished especially suited to bring man to perceive how much God loves him, and thus to call forth the love in which salvation is grounded; and next, to operate as an example of humility and of every virtue." In his apologetical work, he lays special stress on the consideration that the union of God with human nature was to serve the purpose of imparting to men the firmest assurance, that they could attain to supreme blessedness, to immediate fellowship with God, when the wide distance between God and man must have otherwise been to them a cause of despondency. Hence, from that time onward, the longing after blessedness had become vastly stronger among men, and all worship of the creature had been destroyed.

William of Paris, in following the explication of Anselm,[3] has prosecuted it still farther, in a way peculiar to himself. He begins with the principle: "It is the case with spiritual and bodily distempers, that they can only be cured by their opposites,[4] and the satisfaction must

redimeret, quatenus inimicos ad caritatem accenderet, superbos ad humilitatem reduceret.

[1] Modum invenit, per quem utrique satisfecerit tam misericordiae quam justitiae, judicavit igitur, ut assumeret in se poenam pro omnibus et donaret per se gloriam universis. Sermo i, fol. vi, ed. Colon. 1575.

[2] Illam poenam, ad quam omnes ordinantur, et quae continet in se virtute omnes poenas, quamvis non actu. In lib. iii, Sent. Distinct. xx, Quaest. i, Artic. iii.

[3] In his book De causis, cur Deus homo.

[4] L. c. c. v: Quod contraria contrariis curantur tam in spiritualibus, quam in corporalibus.

also be the opposite of the transgression, and commensurate with it, or still beyond it. In the first sin, and every following one, three things go together,— pride, disobedience, and cupidity. Now as in the first sin of man, who was for making himself independent of God, and arrogating to himself equality with God, was exhibited the climax of all this, so the remedy and satisfaction for this could only be again the extreme contrary,— that God himself, the all-sufficient, the Lord of all, should humble himself, subject himself, to the obedience which man was bound to render, and assume his poverty. This alone could be an adequate remedy and an adequate satisfaction, which God as man only could furnish. When, through the love of God, this adequate satisfaction was given, the divine mercy might, without injury to justice, bestow on man the forgiveness of sin, and deliver him from his wretchedness; and thus the antagonism between these two divine attributes was reconciled.[1] Furthermore," he says, "by love, man must be led back to fellowship with God; but nothing is so well suited to excite love as love, the manifestation of love, which enkindles love in return.[2] By nothing, however, could God so show his love as by entering himself into union with human nature, taking upon himself its sufferings by giving up his life for his enemies, which is ever the highest proof of love. The chief end of man, as all true philosophers must own, is divine life, the deification in which the glory of man consists. Accordingly, God must become man by participating in human nature, in order that man might become God by a corresponding participation in the divine nature."[3]

A peculiar mode of contemplating the import and aim of the work of redemption, and one which had not appeared since the time of the systems of the Gnostics and of the Antiochian school, was first brought up again by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century, namely: the view of it as a work necessary to the perfection of the whole universe. This view was connected, in their case, with the investigation of the question whether the incarnation of God must have taken place even if man had not sinned. For inasmuch as by this union of God with the creature the universe is raised to that highest point of perfection to which it could not have otherwise attained, it seemed to them it might be said that this union must have taken place even if there had been no sin. In relation to this question, as to all the rest, the arguments were duly weighed on both sides; and Bonaventura, for instance, brings as a reason on the negative side that, as the incarnation of God was a fact which far surpassed in dignity the work of creation, so it cannot be considered as anything that had a place in the original plan of that work, but a deviation to the opposite of that which should have been, must necessarily precede, in order to furnish the occasion for an

[1] Misericordia et veritas obviaverunt sibi, justitia et pax osculatae sunt. Dum enim altera per viam exigentiae satisfactionis, altera autem per viam omnimodae remissionis incederet, obviam altera alteri nunquam venisset, nisi altitudo divini consilii ambas in uno illo beneficio sociasset.

[2] Quia amor amore convenientius accenditur, sicut ignis igne, decuit Deum amorem nostrum amore suo accendere.

[3] Quid mirum est, Deum esse factum hominem, participatione humanae naturae, ut homo etiam fieret Deus, congruenti sibi participatione deitatis?

adjustment of so extraordinary a nature.[1] After having stated the arguments on both sides, he remarks: "Which side has the best, is known only to him who became incarnate for us. It is difficult to decide between two suppositions which may both pass as conformable to the Catholic faith." He distinguishes between the interest of reason and that of piety. That view appears to him most agreeable to the former, according to which the perfection of the universe, the completion of God's work, required his incarnation; and that view most agreeable to the latter, according to which God is not made dependent on the perfection of the universe; but this fact is contemplated as a work of God's free love for the extirpation of sin, while at the same time it most nearly accords with the sacred Scriptures." To this view likewise Thomas Aquinas most strongly inclines. As the sacred Scriptures uniformly consider the incarnation of God as a necessary remedy against sin, so it is safest to rest satisfied with this view. To the perfection of the universe the natural reference and respect of the creation to God, as the end of all, is sufficient. That personal union of the creature with the Creator transcends the limits of nature, exceeds any perfection which lies within her capacity.[2] There is nothing to forbid the supposition that human nature after the introduction of sin might rise to a higher exaltation,— for God makes evil subservient to good. Thomas Aquinas was assuredly prevented by his moral feelings from becoming clearly conscious to himself that according to his own principles, as already set forth, he must have considered evil as something necessary, in the evolving process of the universe, though he carefully seeks to guard against every such theory by abundant precautions. The supposition, however, that this doctrine virtually lies at bottom in his mind, clearly harmonizes with the fact just stated, that he makes the elevation of the creature above the original capabilities of his nature to depend on the introduction of sin.[3]

The scruples by which his predecessors were deterred from recognizing the necessity of the incarnation of the Son of God in order to the perfection of the universe, are taken notice of by Raymund Lull: "It is, in itself considered, true," he says, "that the incarnation of God can be attributed to no other cause than God's freewill. The creation is a work of God's free love. But this being once supposed, God's assumption of human nature is necessary; for otherwise God would not fulfil the obligations due to himself and his perfections.[4] Upon the introduction of sin, the same was necessary in order that the end for which the world was created might not be defeated, but be realized notwithstanding that disturbance."[5]

As it regards the subjective appropriation of the work of redemption, that view still continued to be the prevailing one in the Western

[1] Quia incarnatio Dei est superexcedentis dignitatis, the excessus oppositorum, per ipsum corrigendorum et restaurandorum must necessarily precede.

[2] Ad perfectionem universi sufficit, quod naturali modo creatura ordinetur in Deum, sicut in finem. Hoc autem excedit limites perfectionis naturae, ut creatura uniatur Deo in persona.

[3] V. Summae, p. iii, Quaest. i, Artic. iii.

[4] Alias Deus non solveret debitum sibi ipsi et suis dignitatibus.

[5] Ut satisfaceret illi fini, ad quem mundus fuit creatus.

church which Augustin had set forth in opposition to Pelagianism, that by *justification* must be understood the inward work of making just, — the sanctification grounded in the fellowship of divine life with Christ,— the subjective in contradistinction from the objective work. And we shall see how this subjective tendency in the mode of contemplating the order of salvation contributed, little as it might seem so at first glance, to keep the religious consciousness in a state of dependence on the tutelage and mediation of the church and the whole churchly theocratic system; as, indeed, the same tendency generally had the most important consequences on the whole process of the development of Christian life in the Middle Ages.[1]

In exhibiting the order of salvation, Bernard distinguished himself in a remarkable manner from the other church-teachers of his time. The experience which he had gained in the history of his own mental conflicts, and in the spiritual guidance of others, led him doubtless to the conviction that, amid the changing moods of subjective feelings, nothing could afford certain repose but an objective ground of trust,— but confidence in Christ as Saviour, and in the grace of redemption. This direction we see him constantly following; though, in the use of the term *justification*, he seems sometimes to waver between the objective and subjective sides. The reference to the objective comes out plainly and distinctly in a passage of his sermons on the Song of Solomon,[2] where, after citing Psalm 31: 2, and Rom. 3: 23, he remarks: "No one is without sin. Sufficient for all justification to me, is the faith that he is gracious to me against whom I have sinned. All that he has decreed not to impute against me, is as if it had never been.[3] Not to sin, is God's righteousness; — God's forgiveness, the righteousness of man." Deserving of notice is also the way in which Bernard seeks to illustrate the doctrine of justification thus understood, by distinguishing between that which is gradual in the process of evolution in time, and that which is timeless in the divine intuition. "The heavenly birth," says he, "is the eternal predestination, by virtue of which God loved his chosen and made them accepted in his beloved Son in that they appear to him, in the Holy One, as conformed to his own image. They stand before the presence of the Father as those who have not sinned; at least, the fact that they have, here vanishes before God's eternal intuition, whose love covers the multitude of sins."[4] And in another sermon he says:[5] "Christ is not only called righteous, but righteousness itself, and justifying righteousness. Thou art as mighty in justifying as thou art rich in forgiving. Whosoever, therefore, is contrite for sin, hungers and thirsts after

[1] See above, page 304.

[2] Sermo xxiii, in Cantica Canticorum, § 15.

[3] Omne, quod mihi ipse non imputare decreverit, sic est quasi non fuerit.

[4] Generatio coelestis aeterna praedestinatio est, qua electos suos Deus dilexit et gratificavit in dilecto filio suo ante mundi constitutionem, sic in sancto apparentes sibi, ut viderent veritatem suam et gloriam suam, quo ejus forent consortes haereditatis, cujus et apparerent conformes imaginis. Hos ergo adventi quasi nunquam peccasse, quoniam et si qua deliquisse videntur in tempore, non apparent in aeternitate, quia caritas patris ipsorum coöperit multitudinem peccatorum.

[5] Sermo xxii, § 8.

righteousness, let him believe on him who justifies the ungodly,—and justified by faith alone he shall have peace with God."[1] Manifestly, he distinguishes here *justification* from sanctification, and derives the latter from the former, as in fact is particularly evident from what follows, where he says: "Whosoever, then, justified from sin, longs and strives after the holiness without which no man can see God, let him hear him who says, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.'"[2] In another passage, however, the two modes of apprehending the notion of justification are confounded together by him, where he says:[3] "Fear goes before, that justification may follow after. Perhaps then we are called in fear, justified through love. The just man, finally, lives by faith; but, without doubt, by that which works by love." He here derives salvation from the eternal counsels of predestination. He considers as the means for the actualization of that which is contained in them, at least in those of mature age, the calling with justification. The man, being filled with love, becomes conscious of his justification.[4] The love that proceeds from faith is to him the source of justification.[5] By virtue of the inherent connection in which faith and love represent themselves to him, he embraces together in his notion of justification the objective and subjective parts of it, in thus expressing himself: "Beloved, we love; loving, we deserve to be loved still more. The Holy Ghost is bestowed on those alone who believe on the Crucified; and faith is powerless unless it works by love. But love is a gift of the Holy Ghost. Who is just, besides him who returns his own love to God, who first loved him?—which is never done but when the Spirit reveals to the man, through faith, the eternal counsel of God respecting his future salvation. Which revelation is certainly nothing else than the infusion of the grace of the Spirit. By this the man is fitted, in that the works of the flesh are mortified, for that kingdom which flesh and blood cannot inherit,—in that he receives at one and the same time, in one Spirit, the consciousness of being loved by God, and the power to love him in return, so that he may not be loved in vain."[6]

The whole systematic theology of these centuries we see interpenetrated and quickened, however, by that which Augustin had represented as the principle of living Christianity as contradistinguished from Pelagianism. Very far were these theologians from substituting any form of legality, or work-holiness, in place of living Christianity. The *externalization* of Christianity which appeared to us in the misgrowths of the churchly life, found no point to fix upon in what they here represented as the principle; though it might do so in the supervening

[1] Quamobrem quisquis pro peccatis compunctus esurit et sitit justitiam, credat in te, qui justificas impium, et solum justificatus per fidem, pacem habebit ad Deum.

[2] Qui ergo justificati a peccatis, sectari desiderant sanctimoniam.

[3] Ep. cvii, § iv.

[4] Sentit se justificari, cum amore perfunditur.

[5] Amor Dei, is duntaxat, qui interim ex fide est, ex quo et nostra fit justificatio.

[6] Quae sane revelatio non est aliud, quam infusio gratiae spiritalis, per quam, dum facta carnis mortificantur, homo ad regnum praeparatur, quod caro et sanguis non possident, simul accipiens in uno spiritu et unde se praesumat amatum et unde redamet, ne gratis amatus sit.

effects. All gave prominence to the idea of a true fellowship of life with Christ, acquired by faith, as absolutely requisite to salvation. They considered it important to distinguish the dead faith, that knew no such fellowship, from the living faith that works by love. Thus Anselm of Canterbury[1] describes dead faith as one to which the object of faith is wholly outward,— living faith, as one to which the object is within,[2]— faith in God, as a faith whereby one enters into a participation of the divine nature.[3] He calls faith something dead when it does not work and live by love.[4] The faith which was accompanied by its corresponding love, could not be inactive when an opportunity presented itself for it to work. Faith is active by reason of the life that resides within it, without which it could effect nothing. Operative faith is called a living faith, because it has in it the life of love; inoperative faith a dead faith, because that life of love is wanting to it with which it could not have been inactive." So also Peter Lombard distinguishes the three acts, *credere in Deum* or *Christum*, *credere Deum*, and *credere Deo*. Faith, in the last two respects, is the bare considering a thing as true, without inward life; the first is that living faith, whereby man enters into fellowship with God, is incorporated into the community with him and his members.[5] With this faith is necessarily connected love. This alone is, according to him, justifying faith (*fides justificans*), that is, faith that makes just or holy. Love is the work of this faith, and the latter the ground of the entire Christian life. Following the Aristotelian distinctions, he denominates that dead faith the yet unorganized matter which must first be actuated by the sealing impress of the form. It is formless, *informis*, *qualitas mentis informis*. Love is this form, which must be impressed upon it. The faith animated by love, the *fides formata*, is a virtue, and the source of all other Christian virtues.

On this foundation proceeded also the schoolmen of the thirteenth century; and new, profound explications of the progressive development of Christian life were added by them.

Dead faith, like all gifts which are not connected with the all-inspiring temper of love,— all isolated gifts, as the gifts of miracles, prophecy, are distinguished by Thomas Aquinas, as *gratia gratis data*,[6] from that grace which alone fits man for attaining salvation, which transports him into a disposition of heart acceptable to God, begets in him faith that works by love, from that divine element as the animating principle of the whole life, the *gratia gratum faciens*. Thomas reckons it to the essence of faith, that the object should not be sufficiently known to the mind to produce conviction by the mind itself, so that the bent of the will must give the turn whereby it inclines to one side rather than to the other.[7] When this is accompanied with doubt

[1] Monolog. c. lxxv.

[2] Mortua fides credit tantum id, quod credi debet, viva fides credit in id.

[3] In Deum credendo tendere in suam essentiam.

[4] Nisi dilectione valeat et vivat

[5] Credendo in Deum ire, ei adhaerere et ejus membris incorporari.

[6] Compare above, page 489.

[7] Intellectus assentit alicui, non quia sufficienter moveatur ab objecto proprio, sed per quandam electionem voluntarie decli

and anxiety lest the opposite may be true, it is called opinion; but when the certainty is present without any such doubt, it is called faith.[1] Accordingly, he defines faith as an act of the mind assenting to divine truth according to the direction of the will moved by divine grace, or by virtue of the impulse given it by such a will.[2] Now inasmuch as the will gives the impulse, and this receives its determination, its particular character, from the end to which it is directed, so it is love by which the will is united with its end, the supreme good. Hence charity is here the animating principle, the *forma fidei*, whereby the mind enters into a true union with the object of its knowledge. It was now a contested point, *how* the transition was made from the *fides informis* to the *fides formata;* whether, when the latter entered the soul, the former retreated from it, or the groundwork of the latter remained and was only raised to a higher power. Thomas asserts the latter. The *habitus*, that is to say, remains the same, inasmuch as it is a capacity of the soul. But by love, is denoted the bent of the will, in which the essence of faith, as such, does not consist; for faith is indeed first an *act* of the intellect. Where imperfection belongs to the conception of the object described as imperfect, there the imperfect must make way for the perfect. But it is otherwise where the imperfect belongs only to the accidental, and therefore the object remains the same, though it loses an accidental predicate, while an imperfect thing grows into a more perfect one, as the boy ever continues to be the same person when he grows up to manhood. Raymund Lull says: "Faith is always something communicated to man by God, that by faith he may rise upward to divine truth, which he never yet could do by means of knowledge. Being a divine gift, this faith is *fides formata*.[3] Its defect is only subjective, arises accidentally in the Christian still beset with sin, in so far as he is estranged by sin from the end for which he was created.[4] Accordingly, the *informitas* is a privation[5] accidentally cleaving to the divine reality, and therefore from the same fundamental essence of the *fides informis*, would arise a *fides formata*, from its being made free from the privation by supervening grace."[6]

Justification is made by Thomas to consist in the infusion of grace. In this, all is given at once; only in thought, different operations are to be considered separately from one another, and amongst these is to be found a certain relation, according to which they condition each other. Thus the first is the infusion of grace: the second, the movement of the free will towards God; next, opposition to sin, then

nans in unam partem magis quam in aliam. Summa, lib. ii, p. ii, Quaest. i, Artic. iv.

[1] Si quidem hoc sit cum dubitatione et formidine alterius partis, erit opinio. Si autem sit cum certitudine absque tali formidine, erit fides.

[2] Actus intellectus assentientis veritati divinae ex imperio voluntatis a Deo motae per gratiam.

[3] Tale esse datum dicitur ens positivum, et est esse formatum, cum Deus non det esse difformatum.

[4] Sed Christianus existens in peccato difformat ipsum per accidens, in quantum se deviat a fine per peccatum, ad quem finem est creatus.

[5] Fides informis quoad hominem peccatorem, non tamen informis quoad se ipsam, cum habet formam sibi coessentialem datam a Deo.

[6] Quaestt. super libb. Sentent. l. iii, Qu. cxiii, et cxiv, t. iv, f. 98, seqq.

forgiveness of sin. With conversion to God, is given abhorrence of sin, as ungodly. The love of God to man is the cause of the peace with God imparted to the man. This love is something eternal and immutable ; but the operation of it takes place in time. This operation taking place in the inner being of the man is grace, by which he who by sin is excluded from eternal life is made worthy of it. Therefore forgiveness of sin cannot be conceived without the infusion of grace. As the love of God consists not only in the inward act of the divine will, but also in a certain operation of grace which accompanies it, so too the fact that God does not impute to the man his sins, carries along with it a certain operation in him to whom God does not impute sin.

From this view of "justification," certain consequences affecting the peculiar order of salvation according to this scheme now resulted, important in their influence on Christian life and the guidance of souls. As the salvation of man was made to depend on this interior subjective working of divine grace, and on the presence of a divine life brought about thereby, as this alone was to constitute the sure mark of adoption into the number of the elect; so the question now arose, which could hardly be answered in a way calculated to promote tranquillity of soul, how is one to be certain of his salvation? No other course was left here but to appeal to inward experience, to the feelings, which in the various moods of mind, affected by so many different influences, and the conflicts continually springing up afresh in such as were actually engaged in the progress of sanctification, could be but an uncertain and unsteady criterion, as all in fact acknowledged, and supposed that no infallible mark could be proposed.

Thus Alexander of Hales, proceeding on the assumption, that neither the cause nor the operation of grace fell within the province of human knowledge concludes from this fact, that no other means remained to man of ascertaining whether or no he was in a state of grace, except the experience of his own feelings.[1] There is no infallible knowledge. It rests solely on three marks; light, peace, and joy in the inner man. And he supposes that this very uncertainty is a fact the most salutary in its influence on the progress of the Christian life, and one which has been so ordered by God on this very account. God has not thought proper to leave us in entire uncertainty on this point, nor yet to give us perfect knowledge. If man should have no experience of the blessed effects of communion with God, he would have nothing to stimulate him to the love of God. But if a perfect certainty of his being in a state of grace were bestowed on him, he would easily fall into pride. So also Thomas Aquinas reckons to the stage of faith the absence of any such certainty with regard to the state of grace,[2] for the same reasons that are assigned by Alexander of Hales; because the principle and the operative cause in grace, is

[1] Scientia affectus, per experientiam rei in affectu.

[2] Nullus certitudinaliter potest scire se habere caritatem, sed potest ex aliquibus signis probabilibus conjicere. In lib. i, Sentent. Distinct. 17, Quaest. i, Artic iv. Ed. Venet. t. ix, p. 223.

God himself, who cannot be an object of immediate intuition in the present life, and hence there can be no certain knowledge of his presence or his non-presence in the human soul.[1] For this reason, one can only infer from certain marks, that he is in a state of grace;[2] he can infer this in so far as he is conscious of having his delight in God, of despising earthly things, and in so far as he knows himself to be guilty of no mortal sin.[3] The only exception relates to those cases where individuals have been favored with the assurance of their being in a state of grace by an express and extraordinary revelation, that so the joy of assurance may already begin with them in the present life, and they themselves may accomplish noble works with the greater confidence and the greater power, and patiently endure the evils of the present life.[4]

What Thomas here says respecting the beneficial influence of the certainty obtained by means of such supernatural revelation in particular cases, is, however, bottomed on the consciousness of the prejudicial influence of the want of such a certainty. The uncertainty must often act as a check on the true cheerfulness of the Christian life, and would impel men to take refuge from the conflicts of the world in the monastic life, and to seek by self-tortures or work-holiness to obtain assurance of the salvation for which they were anxious. This uncertainty led to tormenting reflections on the state of the heart in which anxious souls wasted themselves away. Men were filled with distress on account of the absence of certain *marks* of the state of grace, which they believed they did not possess, and so *labored* with anxious self-tormenting pains to produce such feelings within them. The striving after certainty with regard to the salvation of their own souls, to be obtained by certain excitements of feeling, supernatural revelations, visions, and other evidences of this sort, gave birth to fanatical tendencies. And, on the other side, that uncertainty served to bring the Christian life more and more into a state of dependence on the tutelage of the priesthood and of the church, and all their necessary instrumentalities for attaining to the state of grace; as, in fact, the communication of justifying grace (*gratia justificans*) was made dependent on the sacraments, and it was an important determination for the church system of doctrine, that the sacraments should be considered in a certain sense a cause of this grace.[5] We see how impor-

[1] Principium gratiae et objectum ejus est ipse Deus, qui propter sui excellentiam est nobis ignotus et ideo ejus praesentia in nobis et absentia per certitudinem cognosci non potest. Summae, p. ii, lib. i, Quaest. cxii, Art. v, t. xxi, p. 633.

[2] Cognoscere conjecturaliter per aliqua signa.

[3] In quantum percipit, se delectari in Deo et contemnere res mundanas et in quantum homo non est conscius sibi alicujus peccati mortalis.

[4] He refers to this the passage 2 Corinth. 12: 9, which is inapplicable.

[5] This very thing was said to be that which distinguished the sacraments of the New Testament from those of the Old. The latter merely significabant fidem per quam justificantur homines, the former actually confer such a gratia justificans. It was considered important to hold fast to the objective sanctifying power, which was transferred to the consecrated elements and objectively resided in them, to hold that they communicated gratia justificans ex opere operato; which to be sure was said to denote simply a purely objective operation, was by no means a mere mechanical thing, stand-

tant this shaping of the order of salvation must prove for the whole form of Christian life in the middle ages, and the church theocratical system.

As it regards the power still remaining to freewill in a corrupt nature, and the relation of the free will to the work of conversion or to justification in the sense described, we plainly discern, in the mode after which the theologians of the twelfth century from the beginning onwards explained themselves on this point, the mighty influence of the Augustinian system. But, although determined thereby in their main direction, they were yet led, by their moral interest and by the dialectical wariness which stood connected therewith, to be desirous of avoiding the appearance as if they actually denied freewill, and glorified grace and predestination at the expense of it. The logic of Augustin and the older moderate defenders of this system, had already set them the example in this respect. Here properly belongs Anselm's Dialogue on the free will, and his treatise on the harmony between foreknowledge, predestination, grace, and freewill. His ideas are as follows: No capacity of a created being is, in and of itself considered, in a condition to pass by itself into action. There must first supervene, in order to this, many influences from without. Still, whether this takes place or not, the capacity as such remains the same. Thus, for example, though the eye requires the influence of the sunlight, in order to see, yet it may be said, that even in the dark it still retains the faculty of sight. So stands the case with regard to the relation of the capacity for goodness to the depraved will, although this capacity is never exerted except by those whose depraved wills have been drawn by the irresistible power of grace. Robert Pullein expresses himself wholly as if he ascribed to man the free power of self-determination, by virtue of which he may surrender himself to grace, or unite himself with it. "As often as grace offers itself to any one," says he, "the individual either acts in coöperation with that grace, or, rejecting it, still goes on to sin. The first cause of all goodness is grace. But the free will has also a part to perform, though a subordinate one (as *causa secundaria*). Freewill also has some merit; namely, this, that it ceases to resist the divine will." Afterwards, however, he explains himself in a way that perfectly accords with the

ing in no relation with the state of the heart. Though these theologians, in accordance with that externalization of the conception of humility, sought an exercise of humility for men who had fallen by pride, in requiring them to humble themselves before these outward things, so as by their means to receive grace, yet they always took pains to define the sense in which the sacraments are the cause of grace with great exactness, and to guard by various distinctions against the error of ascribing too much to them. Thomas Aquinas says, the causa principalis gratiae is God; the sacraments are only the causa instrumentalis. But many were actually driven by the effort just alluded to, to ascribe to the sacraments less than the spirit of the church and its doctrine required. Thomas Aquinas cites the opinion of some, whom he controverts: Quod sacramenta non sint causa gratiae aliquid operando, sed quia Deus sacramentis adumbrat in animo gratiam operantem, quod sacramenta non causant gratiam, nisi per quod concomitant virtutem divinam sacramentis assistentem. The matter was illustrated by the case of a king, who had determined to make a distribution of money, and laid it down as one of the conditions, that none should receive any portion of the gift except such as brought with them a certain leaden token as a countersign.

Augustinian scheme. Thus: "If efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*) is but imparted to man, it draws, though without violence, the free will with such force, that it follows without resistance, as if impelled by an inner necessity." "Although," says he, "grace reclaims the wandering, yet it draws them with their own freewill. It does not constrain them contrary to their will. It is so mighty that it transforms even the will of the most obdurate without any difficulty and any violence to each stage of conversion, whenever it pleases." The same held good also of the other systematic theologians of the twelfth century. But we must make special mention of the mystical writers of this century. Their mild practical bent led them to give special prominence to the doctrine of the free will and to represent it as standing in harmony with grace. But yet it may be questioned if they really supposed a free will conditioning grace. Here Bernard's tract, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, takes an important place. The occasion of his writing it was furnished him by a confession, in which he had expressed his sentiments. He recognized, in all the good that was in him, the work of prevenient grace. He hoped by that to make still further progress in holiness and to be carried onward to perfection.[1] This appeared to one who heard it, an extravagant eulogium of grace at the expense of human merit and human activity. Bernard felt himself called upon, therefore, to give an account of the manner in which he conceived grace and freewill to be related to each other. He acknowledged that there is in man an inalienable somewhat, a freedom subjected to no necessity and to no constraint, the faculty of self-determination, the freedom of nature as contradistinguished from the freedom of grace. Freedom, in this latter sense, is the freedom from sin as a state, *material* freedom; in the other sense, it is *formal* freedom. That formal freedom it is, whereby man is distinguished from natural beings. Unless this faculty of freedom always remained with him, there could be no place for moral imputation, no question about either merit or guilt. As the salvation of man proceeds from the operation of grace, so the latter can produce its operation only in the free will.[2] No one obtains salvation against his will. The whole work of the free will, its entire merit, rests upon this, that it consents to the grace that awakens it.[3] Which, however, is not to be so understood as if this consent originated in itself; since, according to the declaration of St. Paul, we are not able of ourselves to think anything as we ought, which is still less than consent. Grace prevents us, by inspiring us with good thoughts, which it does without any aid from us. In transforming our perverse wills, it unites itself with them, so that they consent with it. From God comes the beginning of our salvation, neither through us nor with us.[4] However many our gracious Father, who wills that all men should be saved, seems to

[1] Quod scilicet ab ipsa me in bono et praeventum agnoscerem et provehi sentirem et sperarem perficiendum.

[2] Tolle liberum arbitrium et non erit, quod salvetur, tolle gratiam, non erit unde salvetur.

[3] Quod consentit.

[4] A Deo sine dubio nostrae fit salutis exordium, nec per nos utique nec nobiscum.

draw to his salvation, still, he will hold none worthy of salvation, save such as approve themselves to him as willing. The constraining influences of God on man[1] aim at this very thing, that he should be stimulated to voluntary consent, so that when God changes his will from evil to good, God does not deprive that will of freedom, but transforms it." Now, if we compare all this with what Bernard says concerning the relation of freewill to grace, we can make his determinations with respect to the former harmonize with his declarations concerning the latter, only by supposing that, like Augustin, he leaned upon the assertion that the free will is subjected to no constraint, and no natural necessity; that the form of rational self-determination was ever present, but as one always determined by the almighty influence of grace. On the ground of such a formal, abstract notion of freedom he might say, that this freedom continued to exist in connection with all moral un-freedom, is the same in evil actions and good. And, consequently, we must weigh moreover the fact, that he ever excepted the participation of all in original sin grounded in a hidden chain of evolution, so that therefore that received sinfulness from which man could be freed only by a grace bestowed on him without any help of his own, was still not able to prevent imputation, nor to remove the guilt of the free will.[2] In like manner, Richard a S. Victore could unite Augustin's doctrine of prevenient grace, drawing the will, with the strongest expressions with regard to freewill.[3] "How," says he, "is the will of man not truly free, who can be deprived of his freedom by no constraint; for no creature has power to do it, and it does not become the Creator to do it. But how should the Creator himself be able to do this; he who can do nothing except that which is worthy of him?"[4] He in fact will not admit that this will can be denominated a captive will; because it involves a contradiction to call him free, and at the same time a captive; unless by that term is meant simply his weakness, the being deprived of the original capability.[5] But concerning grace he says also, that it often presented itself to the negligent and careless of its own accord, and was often suddenly and unexpectedly snatched away from our many and earnest efforts. Yet he ascribes to the free will an ability to consent to the evil or the good, to consent to divine grace or not.[6] It can win grace again, but only through grace.[7] As it cannot regain by itself those who are once lost, so it cannot without other help secure those who have been gratuitously

[1] Hoc quippe intendit, cum terret aut percutit, ut faciat voluntarios, non salvet invitos.

[2] Where he is discoursing of the freedom that is the condition of imputation, he adds, c. ii, § 5: Excepto sane per omnia originali peccato, quod aliam constat habere rationem. — c. xii, § 38: Quo non solum non consentiens, verum plerumque et nesciens alia ratione constringitur, necdum renatus baptismate.

[3] De statu interioris hominis, p. i, tract. i, c. xxiii.

[4] Quomodo arbitrium hominis vere liberum non est, quod sua libertate nulla vi, nulla potestate privari potest, nam hoc nec creatura valet, nec creatorem decet. Sed quomodo vel creator hoc potest, qui nihil quod non decet facere potest?

[5] Nihil aliud quam infirmum et nativae possibilitatis virtute privatum.

[6] Potest consentire vel non consentire aspirationi divinae. De statu interioris hominis, p. i, tract. i, c. xiii.

[7] Gratiam, sed gratis, recuperare potest.

(therefore by the operation of grace) regained. Grace may with justice be at any time withdrawn from it, because it is never to be found without fault.[1]

But, in the thirteenth century, we mark two tendencies in the mode of apprehending this doctrine divaricating from each other. One in the order of Franciscan monks, of which Alexander of Hales appears first as the representative, really departs so far from the rigid Augustinian system, as to suppose a grace conditioned in its operations on the free recipiency of the man; the other, led by the logical consistency of its principles even beyond Augustin himself, as we have seen in the principles already lying at bottom in Albert the Great, and still further developed and more clearly expressed by Thomas Aquinas. Alexander of Hales says: "All men are found to be alike corrupt. No one can make himself fit for heaven. God wills according to his highest love to save men, to communicate to them himself; but it is presupposed that there is a recipiency, so far as this is grounded in the moral powers still remaining to man. The light shines everywhere; but its rays do not find everywhere a material susceptible of illumination. No one can render himself sufficiently susceptible for the reception of grace, unless God himself makes him fit for it by his own inward operation. But if he only does what it depends on himself to do, the divine grace ensues by which he is prepared for the reception of grace."[2] He makes use of the following comparison: As when a rich man distributes alms, and two persons are present equally poor; but one stretches out his arm to receive the alms and afterwards receives it, but the other neglects to do so and receives nothing. Thomas Aquinas also starts from the maxim of the Aristotelian philosophy which prevailed in all the schools, that every action, in order to its being accomplished, presupposed a susceptible material prepared for it beforehand.[3] According to his doctrine, therefore, a certain susceptibility was required on the part of man in order to the operation of grace. But it appears evident, from the chain of the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas already unfolded, that he could not allow so very much to depend on creaturely self-determination. Although he presupposes such a necessary susceptibility for the operations of grace, yet he traces even this preparation again to God, to the assistance of God moving the mind to goodness.[4] Whatsoever in man renders him a fit subject for salvation, is all comprehended under the effect of predestination;[5] — every necessary instrumentality for carrying out the decree of predestination.

The above-mentioned preparation for a divine communication to the rational creature by means of a recipiency on his part, by means of

[1] Sicut non potest per se semel amissam recuperare, sic quidem gratis recuperatam non potest nisi ex aliena tutela custodire. L. c. c. xxii.

[2] Quod nullus potest sufficienter se disponere ad salutem, sed si faciat, quod in se est, consequitur dispositio divini adjutorii.

[3] Nulla forma nisi in materia sic disposita.

[4] Ex auxilio moventis animum ad bonum.

[5] Quicquid est in homine, ordinans ipsum in salutem, comprehenditur totum sub effectu praedestinationis.

that which he might be able to do at his own position with the moral power still left to him, was called a *meritum de congruo*.[1] It was the condition ordained of God under which he had decreed to bestow his gifts, in distinction from a merit in the proper sense; concerning which distinction, in its reference to man's original state, we have already spoken.[2] Yet it is easy to gather from what has been said, the difference that prevailed in the mode of applying this idea, when Alexander of Hales actually placed such a condition in the free will. Thomas Aquinas referred all to the divine causality operating in a certain order of sequence by virtue of the form of development in time.

When the distinguished theologians of this period embraced together under the name of theology doctrines of faith and morals, in their works treating of the whole province of theology united both these objects together, this was not a mere outward combination, but really an inward one, founded in the intrinsic connection in their own minds of the doctrinal with the ethical element, as we may gather, in fact, from their anthropology as it has already been explained by us, namely, their doctrine concerning *grace* and *justification* and *faith* in its complete form (*fides formata*), the actuating principle of the Christian life. As the principal work here, we must consider the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, which, in this theological discipline, furnished vastly greater stores than were furnished either by those who preceded or came after him. A particular *Summa* on morals,[3] composed by Nicholas Peraldus (Pérault), archbishop of Lyons, in the thirteenth century, is not to be compared with this in respect of originality and profoundness. The ethical writings of William of Paris, whom we have had occasion to mention so often, e. g. his book *De virtutibus*, is of more importance; and the works of Raymund Lull are rich in ethical matter, particularly his work on the Contemplation of God.

But also in the ethical parts of these systems, two elements occur together; that which proceeded from their unbiased Christian consciousness and their free thoughts as actuated by that consciousness, and that which they must adopt from the church tradition, in which they themselves with their intellects were involved. From this circumstance contradictions might arise, of which they themselves were not conscious. Again, the influence of Aristotle, esteemed by them the philosopher *par eminence*, would necessarily show itself, on this particular side, as of the highest importance with them, as his masterly ability in evolving conceptions and in sound observation shines pre-

[1] According to Thomas Aquinas, videtur congruum, ut homini operanti secundum *suam* virtutem Deus recompenset secundum excellentiam *suae* virtutis. This is so arranged in the divine economy, just as in nature each thing, working after its own peculiar manner, attains to the end for which God has designed it. In the case of the rational creature, however, this takes place by means of self-determination by the free will, and hence is called a *merit*. Here there is always congruitas propter *quandam* aequalitatem proportionis. The *adequate relation*, meritum condignum, quod aequatur mercedi, is quite another thing. Such a relation can never exist between creaturely acts and supernatural communication, but only between the supernatural itself, that which proceeds from the grace of the Holy Spirit, in so far as the latter is the principle, and the communication of eternal life.

[2] Page 489.

[3] Summa de virtutibus et vitiis.

eminently forth in him as a moralist; and so many things were to be met with in his ethical works, which might be appropriated even by such as stood on Christian grounds, at least with certain modifications demanded by the Christian principle; for every sound position of an earlier development, ought certainly to be adopted, and first brought to its full import and significance by Christianity. But the Aristotelian system of morals had its root entirely, it must be owned, in the distinctive ground occupied by the antique world, though soaring in occasional flashes of thought above that inferior position, and containing vaticinations of a loftier one destined at some future time to be the inheritance of mankind. Many of his principal ethical ideas are necessarily connected throughout with that which in the mode of life and thought in antiquity constituted an antagonism to Christianity. In order, therefore, to a right application of Aristotle's ethical ideas in the Christian system of morals, an exact and sharply defined line of demarkation was required between the fundamental positions occupied by the ancient world and by pure Christianity, a sifting apart of that which was related and that which was opposed in the two different positions; of that which could only be adduced as antagonistic to the properly Christian view, for the purpose of rendering the latter more distinct and clear, and of that which after being modified by the Christian principle might be appropriated. But in order to this was required a species of criticism proceeding from the intelligent examination of the facts of history, which was by no means given to the profound and acute perceptions of these men. They were liable to be easily misled by their admiration and reverence of the great master, to allow undue importance to his conceptual distinctions, whether it was that they distorted these notions themselves by laying into them something more or other than they meant, or that, in applying them to the Christian province, they injured and troubled that province itself. The latter would be more likely to happen in those cases where an occasion for it was already furnished in a troubling of the Christian consciousness that had arisen at some earlier period, where already, in the church tradition, the antagonisms of the ancient world overcome by primitive Christianity had been again introduced by the false Catholic element. And what we have said with regard to the influence of the Aristotelian principles, will have to be applied also to the influence of the Neoplatonic, inasmuch as the grand position of the antique world expresses itself in both in certain aspects.

Most assuredly we meet in these theologians with an important line of demarkation, which might seem to denote the same thing with a distinct separation of the different positions held by the ancient world and Christianity, — the distinction, namely, between the moral virtues recognized already in the ante-Christian period, that is, the cardinal virtues, and the theological virtues. The former stand connected with the fitness of the moral nature in itself, the purely human as such; the latter, with the higher fitness superinduced upon man's nature by a supernatural divine principle, — the ennobling of the purely human by a divine life. By the general conception virtue, Thomas

Aquinas understands the capacity or fitness required in a rational being as a means of answering the end for which he is destined. But here he distinguishes a twofold point of view, and a corresponding twofold end and twofold instrumentality required in order to reach it; the happiness answering to the nature of the creaturely reason, and implied in its essence, to which man may attain[1] by the powers implanted in his nature, the highest end of reason left to itself and not enlightened by revelation, and the end of a blessedness transcending the nature of the creaturely reason, consisting in the supernatural fellowship with God, which proceeds only from some new communication grounded in a free determination of the divine will. In order to the attaining to this there was required, therefore, a new instrumentality in accordance with it, in the new powers communicated to human nature by grace, a certain participation of the divine nature by the human.[2] Thomas, moreover, perceived, being in this respect a predecessor of Schleiermacher, that the precise number of the four cardinal virtues was not a mere accidental and arbitrary thing. He sought to point out the necessity of this numerical division as requisite in order to a perfect realization of the dominion of reason in the life of humanity. As all virtue has respect to rational good (*bonum rationis*), this rational good, in order to hold out a light to action, must be given as an object of knowledge. Thus we are presented with that which went under the name of *prudence*. Next, arises the requisition to manifest in the world, to exhibit in action, the *ordo rationis* received in the form of knowledge.[3] Inasmuch as this is done in our intercourse with others,[4] it is called *justice*. Then, in order to the actual realization of all this, it is necessary that the passions resisting the *ordo rationis* should be subjected to it, that this *ordo* should be preserved and defended against their encroachments. And this must be done in a twofold manner, having respect to the twofold description of passions;[5] those that incite men to do that which is contrary to reason, those that hinder them from doing what reason requires.[6] To counteract the first kind of passions, that power of reason is required whereby such passions are restrained, that is, *temperance*. In respect to the second, man must be firm in that which reason requires: this is the work of *fortitude*.

Now as Thomas endeavors to demonstrate the necessity of the cardinal virtues, as the means of actually realizing the appropriate end of reason, so he applies the same to the relation to that supernatural end, and the instrumentality of the theological virtues, necessary in order to attain it. Here, as also in the case of the virtues suited and assigned to the position of pure reason, the different powers of the mind,

[1] Beatitudo proportionata humanae naturae, ad quam homo pervenire potest per principia suae naturae.

[2] Beatitudo naturam humanam excedens, ad quam homo sola divina virtute pervenire potest secundum quandam divinitatis participationem.

[3] Ordo rationis circa aliquid ponitur.

[4] Ordo rationis circa operationem.

[5] Passiones impellentes ad aliquid rationi contrarium.

[6] The passiones retrahentes ab eo, quod ratio dictat.

the intellectual and voluntary faculties, must be called into requisition. The intellect appropriates to itself the revealed truths which man must know in order to attain to that end, by *faith*. The will must direct itself towards that end, as an attainable one; this is done by *hope*.[1] And again, the will must, by a certain spiritual union, become assimilated with that towards which it directs itself as the end to be reached;[2] this is *love*.

But how much soever truth may lie at bottom of this distinction of the two points of view, and the capacities of mind having respect to them, still, we meet here with the same separation between the natural and the supernatural, the human and the divine, hindering the apprehension and application of the Christian principle, which lay at bottom of the severance of the *pura naturalia*, and the *dona supernaturalia, superaddita*, in man's primeval state. The whole would have assumed a quite different arrangement, in case it had been perceived that the destination grounded in pure nature as such, the original *ordo rationis*, is precisely that, the actual realization of which had been interrupted by sin, and should be brought about by the redemption and the divine principle of life founded thereon; that the very thing which lay in the essence of the cardinal virtues, could only attain, in connection with the supervening principle in the theological virtues, its true significance and application. Thus the view of Christianity as a restoration of the truly human, as an ennobling of the human by the divine, would have presented itself; as most assuredly expressions pointing to this same thing occur in these theologians, which were duly repressed, again, by other influences, and could not be carried through and applied in a consistent manner; expressions implying that by grace nature is not destroyed, but potentiated and ennobled.

The doctrine of the seven spiritual gifts, though the number seven and its designation was borrowed accidentally from the text, Isa. 11: 2, according to the Vulgate, might doubtless be employed for the purpose of passing over from the antique view of the cardinal virtues to the Christianly-modified view. Thomas considers these gifts as the medium, serving to the end that the work of the Holy Spirit may go on in the soul by means of the theological virtues, that the soul may be brought into entire harmony with the relation to God, with the dominion of the Holy Spirit. He compares the above-named spiritual gifts, in this respect, with the moral virtues, so called in the more limited sense, as the means to make everything that resists subject to the order of reason (*ordo rationis*). Accordingly, these gifts were to operate in such manner as to subject everything to that higher order of the Holy Spirit, and he considered them as the very means whereby the natural should be freed from the defects cleaving to it, and advanced in its evolution.[3]

The same point of view we find, likewise, in William of Paris, but

[1] Voluntas, quae ordinatur in illum finem, sicut in id, quod possibile est consequi.

[2] Quantum ad unionem spiritalem, per quam quodammodo transformatur in illum finem.

[3] Per has virtutes, quae dicuntur dona Spiritus Sancti, illa naturalia reformantur atque adjuvantur.

carried out after a profound and original manner. He distinguishes, which is nothing peculiar to him, but, as an imitation of the Aristotelian method of division, common to him with others, — the natural virtues, those founded in natural capacity (virtues of temperament), those acquired by exercise (*virtutes consuetudinales*, *acquisitae*), and those derived from the divine principle of life, from grace, ennobled virtues. The natural virtues he compares with the natural members of the body; the acquired, with the substitutes, helps, and supports framed by art for maimed or enfeebled limbs. These helps supplied by art cannot, however, answer the end of, or restore the powers of, nature. The same holds true of that which moral effort and practice can effect in relation to a nature depraved and enfeebled by sin. It is only by grace that true virtue is bestowed on man; it is only by this, that those wings are given to the mind, with which it soars upward to the divine. William of Paris vigorously attacks, as Pelagian, the assertion that, between that which is natural and that which is bestowed by grace, the difference is one of degree, and not of kind. But he also starts from that distinction between the *pura naturalia* and the *donis gratiae*. He also distinguishes the relation of uncorrupted nature to its commensurate world, and its exaltation above itself; the super-earthly direction communicated to it, the necessary intermediation in order to the supernatural blessedness by grace.[1]

From that view of the relation between the cardinal virtues and the theological virtues which we have described, the result is not that all the cardinal virtues must coöperate in order to shape the world by the principle of the theological virtues, to use and appropriate it for the kingdom of God; the divine principle attacking and appropriating to introduce both in connection with each other into the world, which it is destined to control; but something appears as the highest work and end of the theological virtues, which reaches beyond the province of those subordinate virtues, in relation to which they appear simply as preparatory and initiatory, viz. the desecularizing and dehumanizing of the individual that devotes himself wholly to God, by the contemplation of the spirit soaring upward to him as its sole object. Thus that Aristotelian view of the moral element as of the barely human, in opposition to the superhuman, the divine, taking occasion from many erroneous tendencies that had long prevailed in the church life, may have found entrance. Thus might that opposition between divine and human virtue, *ἀρετὴ πολιτική*, which had been overcome by the Christian principle, be once more adopted from Aristotle and the Neo-Platonists; and important were the consequences which resulted from that cause. Thus that division of the virtues was imitated from Plotinus,[2] which is so wholly incongruous with the Christian principle of the theocratical appropria-

[1] Sicut naturales *verae* virtutes (not at present in the state of corruption) animam tenent, custodiunt et conservant in statu suo et rectitudine naturali, sic istae sublimes et nobiles virtutes eam rapiunt et elevant a se ipsa, hoc est, a naturalibus suis et, supra se velut suspensam, in spiritualibus et aeternis eam tenent. De virtutibus, f. 137, seqq.

[2] See his Book of the Virtues. Ennead. i. lib. ii.

tion of the world, so favorable to the one-sided ascetic, and unfavorable to the appropriating tendency,—the division of them, namely,[1] into the exemplary (*exemplares*), the purifying (*purgatoriae*), and the political. These political virtues, destined to shape the life, appear as the subordinate ones.[2] The middle place is given to the *virtutes purgatoriae*, since by purifying the soul they render it capable of rising from the human to the divine, and of surrendering itself wholly to the latter after the completion of the purifying process.

Starting from this distinction of a purifying virtue, Thomas places *prudence* in the contempt of all worldly things and a mind bent solely on God; *temperance*, in withdrawing as much as possible from the objects of sense; *fortitude*, in not allowing the soul to be terrified when it withdraws itself from all objects of sense, and turns to the contemplation of things heavenly alone; *justice*, in the surrendry of the soul to precisely this order. The highest stage, then, where this purification has arrived at its completion, must belong to the virtue of a soul wholly absorbed in contemplation, perfectly purified; which is the virtue of the blessed, or of the most perfect in this life.

In strict accordance, moreover, with these views, Thomas describes it as the work of temperance, considered in the light of the *ordo rationis*, that the body should be made suitable for becoming an organ of reason; while, however, he reckons to the essence of temperance, in the supernatural sense, as it is wrought in man by the operation of grace, the *temperantia infusa*, this additional element, that fastings and abstinence must be required.[3]

From the combination of these different elements in the ethical system of Thomas, many apparently gross contradictions may be explained. We might think that the answer to the question, whether there is any class of actions morally indifferent or permissible, not coming under the province of duty, must determine the decision of another, namely, whether there is a condition of moral perfection above law, or transcending the province of duty and obligation. We might suppose that, from the denial of a void space for actions indifferent or permitted, from the assertion that duty must embrace the whole of life, must also follow the denial of such a higher condition; but we find these modes of contemplation in Thomas placed in a different relation to one another.

He has investigated the question about indifferent actions (*adiaphora*) with great acuteness, in a distinct section; and maintains that if we contemplate actions in their true and real connection, we shall find that nothing is indifferent, because every action is either one corresponding or not corresponding to the order of reason (*ordo rationis*), and nothing can be conceived as holding a middle place. He at the same

[1] In the Dialogue, cited on a former page, inter philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum, published by Prof. Rheinwald, p. 67, where, too, Plotinus is expressly quoted.

[2] Secundum quas homo recte se habet in rebus humanis gerendis, according to Thomas Aquinas.

[3] In sumtione ciborum ratione humana modus statuitur, ut non noceat valetudini corporis nec impediat rationis actum. Secundum autem regulam legis divinae requiritur, quod homo castiget corpus suum et in servitutem redigat per abstinentiam cibi et potus et aliorum hujusmodi.

Prima secundae, Quaest. lxiii, Artic iv t. xxi, p. 311.

time explains whence it is that the appearance has arisen of a class of actions indifferent. It is because there are actions which, considered in general, without any more exact specification, appear as if indifferent; which same actions, if considered in a particular case, in a more exactly determined connection, must be declared to be bad or good.[1] Indifferent actions are, in his view, those which as yet want those marks by means of which a moral judgment of them would be possible, those which are not as yet sufficiently defined, so that they may be taken into the series of moral actions.[2] "Thus," he says, "eating and sleeping are things in themselves indifferent; yet both are subservient to virtue with those who use the body generally as an organ of reason." At the same time, Thomas had adopted into his system the doctrine, which had long obtained in the church tradition, of a higher perfection, consisting in the observance of the *consilia evangelica*. And this doctrine was, in his case, by no means at variance with the principle just explained by us, since he supposed a mode of life transcending the province of purely human action, wholly renouncing the world, and devoted solely to the contemplation of God. And this agrees, perfectly, with that division of the virtues which we have already noticed.

The *praecepta* relate, according to his doctrine, to that which is *necessary* in order to arrive at eternal felicity. The *consilia*, to that whereby one may better and more easily attain to the same end. "Man," says he, "stands midway between the things of this world and spiritual good; so that the more he devotes himself to the latter, the more he withdraws from the former. Whoever, then, places his supreme good in the things of this world, becomes wholly estranged from spiritual good; and to such a bent of disposition, the precepts stand opposed. But in order to attain to the above-mentioned end, it is not required that one should wholly cast aside the things of this world; as one who uses the things of this world may attain to everlasting life, provided only he does not make them his supreme end. Still, it will be easier for him, if he renounces the things of this world *entirely*." It is manifest how this whole distinction of a twofold renunciation of the world in the observance of the *praecepta* and of the *consilia*, rests precisely on the circumstance that the real connection between the negative and positive sides of the Christian principle, between virtue combating and virtue appropriating the world, between the Christian renunciation and the Christian appropriation of the world, is not recognized,—on the not perceiving that the requisition, rightly understood, of the precepts which relate to the total renunciation of the world with the total appropriation of it for the kingdom of God, excludes room for anything higher. And it may easily be shown, too, how the same fundamental mistake betrays itself in the separating the negative and positive elements in the more exact determination of the three *consilia evangelica*,[3]—the total renunciation of earthly goods separated from

[1] Contingit quandoque, aliquem actum esse indifferentem secundum speciem, qui tamen est bonus vel malus in individuo consideratus.

[2] Indifferens quasi extra genus moralium actionum existens.

[3] As Thomas says, in the total renunciation of the three things wherein sin reveals

the appropriation of them; the total suppression of the sexual instinct, instead of the control over it in the appropriation of a form of moral society necessary for the manifestation of the kingdom of God; the total, barely negative denial of one's own will, whereby, in contrariety to its native dignity, it is made the blind tool of another creaturely will, instead of the positive appropriation of it as an organ for the divine will as this reveals itself to an enlightened reason. Not recognizing, that the condition of Christian freedom stands only in the essence of that love which freely fulfils the precepts from an impulse within, Thomas places this condition in a self-will exalted above law. He accounts, among the marks distinguishing the Old and New Testament points of view, that in the latter, as the law of liberty, counsels are added to commands which require unconditional obedience, — counsels, the following of which is left entirely to free choice.[1]

And not barely in reference to the three *consilia* above described, but also in reference to other departments of action coming under the cognizance of the *praecepta*, Thomas distinguishes a perfection reaching beyond mere conformity to the law of duty. He distinguishes that which, in itself considered, is a *consilium*, from that which is such only under certain circumstances and in certain relations;[2] as, for example, when one gives alms, does good to his enemies where he is under no obligations to do so, forgives injuries which he might retaliate. But here he was met by the precept so clearly expressed in the sermon on the mount; still, he contrives to evade the difficulty, by erroneously applying here a rule correct enough in itself, that, in the sermon on the mount, we must distinguish the reference to the temper of the heart, and to the individual action. He says that the love to our enemies required in the sermon on the mount is, indeed, a *precept* in reference to the *praeparatio animi*, and something necessary to salvation; but that the action in particular cases, where no particular necessity existed, belonged to a *consilium particulare*.

How Thomas allowed himself to be misled, by the influence of the Aristotelian ethics, into the mistake of adopting ideas which belong altogether to the ancient world, and stand properly in contradiction with Christian morals, and how he labored to get rid of this contradiction, is especially illustrated by one example. The antique notion of magnanimity (*μεγαλοψυχία*), finely explicated by Aristotle, belongs in truth wholly to the heathen morality, is necessarily connected with the ethical self-sufficiency, the self-feeling, of antiquity; and stands in contradiction with the essence of Christian humility. But Thomas, who appropriates this notion under the name of *magnanimitas*, takes the greatest pains to reconcile this contrariety. Attaching himself to Aristotle, he describes this virtue as one which holds great honors within

itself, — the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life, to which the three consilia relate.

[1] Quod praeceptum importat necessitatem, consilium in optione ponitur ejus, cui datur. Et ideo convenienter in lege nova, quae est lex libertatis, supra praecepta addita consilia, non autem in veteri lege, quae erat lex servitutis.

[2] Consilium simpliciter and consilium secundum quid.

the bounds of reason;[1] and he then endeavors to show, that the self-feeling, the sense of one's own dignity, which belongs to the nature of magnanimity, is not incompatible with the essence of humility. He maintains that the contradiction between these two virtues was only in appearance.[2] It was only needful in the case of these two virtues to distinguish their different relations.[3] Magnanimity allows man to exalt himself in consideration of the gifts he has received from God.[4] Humility leads man to think lowly of himself in view of his own defects.[5] But humility does not in fact relate merely to the sense of one's own defects, but to the sense of the absolute dependence of all creaturely beings, the nothingness of everything, as referred simply to itself, and not contemplated as a gift received from God. Now this, undoubtedly, instead of excluding from, includes in itself, that feeling of elevation which is grounded in the consciousness of fellowship with God, denoted by the expression *ἐν κυρίῳ καυχᾶσθαι*; but still, this is quite another thing from the sense of one's own greatness and dignity implied in the *μεγαλοψυχία*. Then again, the contempt of others, springing from this state of mind, is said to refer to them only so far as they are destitute of God's gifts.[6] Humility, on the other hand, should honor and highly esteem others, so far as it perceives in them any of these gifts of God. But really, this recognition of each man in the condition where God has placed him, excludes the above-mentioned contempt. While Aristotle reckons it as belonging to the essence of *μεγαλοψυχία*, that it should not willingly receive benefits from others, because this would be at variance with that self-feeling, would be self-humiliating, Thomas endeavors even here to set aside that which is foreign from the Christian point of view, by explaining it in the sense that to this virtue it does not seem desirable to receive benefits without repaying them with others still greater, which, in fact, he says, belongs to the perfection of gratitude, in which, as in all other virtues, the magnanimous spirit will be preëminent.

We must acknowledge then, it is true, that Thomas does not here distinguish with sufficient precision the antique and Christian points of view; that he knows not how to take the notion of Aristotle in connection with the former of these points of view, and according to its own proper essence; that he does violence to it, and endeavors to blend together conflicting elements. But we must also acknowledge the freedom of spirit with which, from his own ascetical point of view, he was able to discern some truth at bottom capable of being united with the essence of humility, in that notion of magnanimity, though he did not draw with sufficient clearness and precision the line of demarkation which separated it from the antechristian notion; from that which belonged exclusively to the antique point of view.

[1] Quae modum rationis ponit circa magnos honores.

[2] Quia in contraria tendere videntur.

[3] Quia procedunt secundum diversas considerationes.

[4] Facit, quod homo se magis dignificet secundum considerationem donorum, quae possidet e Deo.

[5] Facit, quod homo seipsum vilipendat secundum considerationem proprii defectus.

[6] Deficiunt a donis Dei.

If he had held fast simply to the truth at bottom, much that is so one-sided in his ascetical view of the matter would have been overcome.

We should mention, moreover, in reference to the controversies with Abelard, that the disputed question then brought up about the relation of the intention to actions, in judging of their moral character, was answered by this great teacher, Thomas Aquinas, with great clearness, and so as to avoid the opposite errors on both sides: "It is undoubtedly the case," says Thomas, "that the moral character of an action depends on the disposition, the end, which the will proposes. The action, by itself considered, can add nothing; in that, the will simply goes into effect. But the question arises, Is the will strong enough to produce the act, to pass into fulfilment? When one will proposes to do something good or bad, but desists from its purpose on account of obstacles in the way; while another continues acting till it has accomplished the object proposed, the latter will is manifestly a persevering one, in the good or bad sense;[1] and by this is to be estimated the *degree* of goodness or badness, the *intensity* of the good or bad will. That only is a perfect will which acts when an opportunity is presented.[2] But then, if the failure of execution proceeds solely from the want of opportunity, if the execution depends on outward conditions which do not stand within the man's control, the failure, in such cases certainly is not to be attributed to the will."[3]

II. The Greek Church and its Relation to the Latin.

In comparison with the fulness of life, manifesting itself under such a diversity of forms, and moving in such various directions, in the church of the West, the Greek church presents a melancholy spectacle of stiff and torpid uniformity. While the ecclesiastical monarchy of the West could lead onward the mental development of the nations to the age of majority, could permit and promote freedom and variety within certain limits,— the brute force of Byzantine despotism, on the other hand, stifled and checked every free movement. To all which the Greek church had in common with the Latin, the animating spirit was still wanting. Thus we have seen how the monasticism of the Western church carried within itself a principle of reaction against its own corruptions, and hence new forms of regeneration were continually springing out of it. In the Greek church the monastic life stood, it is true, in equally high estimation as in the Latin, and was enabled to exercise a great influence; but it was very far from being the case that this influence was so extensive and penetrating as in the Latin church; or that so much good, along with the evil, proceeded from it. Monasticism here remained motionless in the old petrified forms. It

[1] Manifestum, quod hujusmodi voluntas est diuturnior in bono vel malo.
[2] Non est perfecta voluntas, nisi talis, quae opportunitate data operetur.
[3] Defectus perfectionis, quae est ex actu exteriori, est simpliciter involuntarius.

was far less practical than in the Western church; and yet, it was not less overpowered by worldliness,— but without reproducing again out of itself so powerful an opposition to the worldly spirit.

In the twelfth century appeared every form of self-castigation among the Greek monks. Some passed their lives on high trees (*δενδρῖται*); others on pillars, either in the open air or in close dwellings erected on lofty scaffoldings;[1] others, in subterranean caves or catacombs; others encased themselves in iron coats of mail.[2] But more frequent than the extravagant self-mortification proceeding from the earnestness of a mistaken piety and a misdirected striving after Christian perfection, was the mock-holiness which affected severity of living merely as a mask and outside show, for the purpose of winning high veneration and bountiful gifts from the multitude. Such were those monks whom Eustathius describes as all factitious from head to foot.[3] They contrived by various impostures to make their monasteries famous for miracles,— till the fraud was detected, when the wonders ceased;[4] or by pretended visions, to invest themselves with an air of sanctity,[5] so as to attract the multitude, and open a profitable source of gain. But what especially contributed to the corruption of the monastic life, and its mischievous influence, was the vast numbers from the lowest classes, workmen[6] and beggars, who withdrew to the monasteries for the sole purpose of gaining a subsistence without toil,— or culprits, who fled to them to escape the punishment of their crimes.[7] Hence, among the monks were to be found the rudest and most ignorant people,— enemies to all science and culture; and the rich libraries of the monasteries went fast to destruction. It was in vain to inquire after ancient books; these had long since been among the missing.[8] If a man of literary attainments proposed to join the monks, he became for that very reason an unwelcome, suspected guest; and every possible obstacle was thrown in his way.[9] This sort of people, after having secluded themselves for a while, appeared publicly again in another shape. The air of sanctity which they affected enabled them to gain more than others by their bargains and sales, and to grow richer by agriculture and cattle-breeding.[10] With a view to counteract the worldly traffic and cupidity of the monks, the emperor Manuel Comnenus allowed the newly-founded monasteries to own no property, but directed that they should be furnished with all that was needful for their subsistence from the imperial treasury; and he renewed a decree

[1] *στυλῖται* and *κιονῖται*.

[2] Vide Eustath. ed. Tafel. p. 27, the different classes of monks: *τοὺς ἡγιασμένους τῷ ὑφῷ ἀσκητάς, τοὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, τοὺς στυλίτας, τοὺς χωστοὺς, τοὺς ἐγκλείστους*. Eustathius of Thessalonica names (p. 189) the different classes of monks at that time: *οἱ γυμνῆται, οἱ χαμεύναι καὶ ἀνιπτόποδες, οἱ ῥυπῶντες, οἱ σιγῶντες, σπηλαρῶται, σιδηρούμενοι, δενδρῖται, κιονῖται*, the *στυλῖται*, who were distinguished from the Kionites, by the fact that they were shut up out of sight, *ὡς ἐγκλείστοι*.

[3] *πεπλασμένους ὅλους ἐκ ποδῶν ἕως κεφαλῆς*. His tract, *περὶ ὑποκρίσεως*, p. 94.

[4] See Eustath. p. 230.

[5] The same, p. 243.

[6] See e. g. Eustathius on the improvement of the monastic life. p. 251: *γριμματα οὐκ οἰδασιν, ἐξ ἐργαστηριων οἱ πλειους ἡκοντες καὶ ἄλλως δε χειρώνακτες ὄντες*.

[7] Ap. eund. p. 223.

[8] Ap. eund. p. 249 ff.

[9] Ap. eund. p. 244.

[10] Ap. eund. p. 229.

of the emperor Phocas against multiplying the landed estates of the monasteries.[1] Eustathius extols also the prudence of this emperor, in appointing secular officers for the great monasteries, to superintend the management of their revenues, so as to relieve the monks from business foreign to their vocation.[2]

Under the Comnenes, a fresh zeal was awakened for literary studies in the Greek empire. The chief direction of them was intrusted to a college of twelve learned men under a president;[3] which college, moreover, was to have the first voice in the deciding of controversies of doctrine, an authority which, we must allow, would be likely to prove extremely cramping. But though many remains of ancient learning were preserved, and individual theologians appeared who distinguished themselves by their erudition, yet the fresh, living spirit was always wanting, which alone can give a spring to scientific development. They never went beyond the compiling together and handing down of traditional lore; and artificial ornaments deformed even the better productions of those times.

Among the learned theologians of the twelfth century, we may mention Nicetas, bishop of Chonae,[4] in Phrygia, eminent as a doctrinal and polemical writer, and belonging also among the Byzantine historians; the monk Euthymius Zigabenus, who, with Theophylact, mentioned in the preceding period, is to be reckoned among the most distinguished exegetical writers of this period; and Nicholas, bishop of Methone, in Messenia.[5] All, however, were eclipsed by an individual comparatively unknown until in these recent times,[6] but who was no less distinguished for his extensive learning, than for a noble spirit of reform flowing from truly Christian motives. This was Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica, author of the famous commentary on Homer, one of those pure characters, so rarely to be met with among the Greeks, — a man who well knew the failings of his nation and his times, while he was more exempt from them than any of his contemporaries. In his remarkable work on hypocrisy, he mentions falsehood and empty pretence, which he hated above all things, as being the sins by which public and private life among all ranks of society was then polluted. Great were the services he rendered to his fellow-citizens under the bad administration of the empire in the minority of Alexius the Second, subsequent to the year 1180. When Thessalonica was conquered by the army of king William the Second, of Sicily, and the city given up to the fury of soldiers excited, in addition to

[1] See Nicetas Choniat, history of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (lib vii. c. iii, p. 370, ed. Bekker), which historian also confesses that the worldliness of the monks called for these restrictions.

[2] On the improvement of the monastic life, § 124. p. 244.

[3] Duodecim electi didascali, qui studiis Graecorum de more solent praeesse. See the Dialogue of Anselm, of Havelberg, in D'Achery Spiceleg, t. i, f. 171.

[4] The city anciently called Colosse.

[5] See respecting these men, and the doctrinal history of the Greek church in the twelfth century, the essay of Dr. Ullmann in the Studien und Kritiken. Year 1833. 3tes Heft.

[6] By the meritorious labors of Prof. Tafel in Tübingen, who we confidently hope will succeed in clearing up many of the obscure points in the life of this remarkable man. May his essay on the chronology of Eustathius's writings soon appear.

other bad passions, by fanaticism, Eustathius, who shrunk from no danger or toil, appeared as a protecting angel in the midst of his people. It was his courage and awe-commanding person alone which could procure for the unfortunate any alleviation of their sufferings. His powerful word protected his fellow-citizens, when threatened with heavy oppressions by the arbitrary power at Constantinople, against the extortions of the tax-gatherers.[1] Yet he had a great deal to suffer from the ingratitude of his community, who could not endure the freedom with which he rebuked iniquity.[2] He was banished by partisans; and afterwards, when the people learned from experience how much they had lost in their bishop, recalled with greater affection than ever.[3]

He appears to us as the Chrysostom of his times, in contending against its superstition, mock-holiness, and indecorous frivolity. His fast-sermons especially bear witness of the zeal with which he waged this contest. In the lightness with which marriages were contracted, and matrimonial relations generally regarded, he found special cause of complaint. It seems that many affected a certain pretentious, shallow kind of free-thinking, to which they retreated as a cover from the pungent sermons or moral oversight of the more worthy ecclesiastics. They drew a line of distinction between the church, for which they professed the greatest zeal, and the clergy in their personal capacity. "God is all-sufficient in himself," said they; "he needs nothing which is upon earth."[4] The opposition to superstition may perhaps have called forth infidelity. So we might infer from a remark of Eustathius on the indulgence shown to atheists living amongst Christians.[5] While he adopted the dominant church mode of thinking, which indeed bore him along with it, Eustathius still sought to transform and renovate

[1] These meritorious acts of Eustathius in behalf of the city of Thessalonica, are extolled by Nicetas, bishop of Athens, in his Monodia on Eustathius, published with several other records abounding in important matter relating to the history of these times, by Prof. Tafel, in the Appendix to his Dissertatio Geographica de Thessalonica ejusque agro, Berolini, 1839, p. 382. He represents the widowed city Thessalonica complaining: *παντως φοραλόγοις ἐκκεισομαι· παντως δασμολόγοις βρωθήσομαι, ὡς ἐτοίμη καὶ ἀγαθὴ θήρα καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρωποφάγοις τούτοις θηρσὶν ἔκδοτος. οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐπαγρυνήσει μοι ἐκεῖνος ὁ μέγας ἐμὸς ποιμὴν καὶ μυρίοις διεγρηγορὼς ὄμμασιν*, p. 387. It is to be lamented that this Greek eulogium is so full of rhetorical declamation as to leave but little room for facts.

[2] Ep. xix, ad Thessalonicenses.

[3] Michael Nicetas says, in a letter to Eustathius; *μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν νῦν οἱ ποθοῦντες πλέον τῷ πόθῳ κάμνουσι, παρόσον τῇ ἀποστάσει μανθάνουσιν, οἷον ἔχοντες ἀγαθὸν ἐλάνθανον ἑαυτούς*. See Tafel's Dissertation on Thessalonica, above referred to, p. 354.

[4] As he says, *φιλοσοφοῦντες, ὡς ἀπροσδεὲς μὲν πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς* (*τὸ θεῖον*, without doubt omitted) *ἐπὶ γῆς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτούς*.

[5] He employs the climax: Jews, bad Christians, and *τομειζον τὰ τῶν ἀθέων φῦλα*. Fast-sermon, xi, p. 66. The interpretation of this passage is, to be sure, a matter of dispute. Tafel, in the prolegomena to the Dissertation above noticed, p. xvii, is disposed to understand by atheists, Mahommedans; in favor of which it might be said that atheists, if any such existed, would not have dared, however, so openly to show themselves as such. Still, though Eustathius did not concede, that the Mohammedans worshipped the same God with Christians and Jews, the true God, when from his own point of view he could call them idolaters, yet it is difficult to conceive that he should have called them directly atheists, unless perhaps he considered himself entitled to do so, by a rhetorical exaggeration, on account of this antithesis to Christians and Jews who worshipped the true God.

all, beginning back from the spirit and disposition. Accordingly, he makes the *consilia evangelica* his point of departure, recognizing monachism as the summit of Christian perfection; and, misapprehending the words of Christ, contrasts the mild and easy yoke of the ordinary Christian life with the heavy yoke which the monks had to bear. Thus, in exhorting laymen to Christian virtue, by comparing their case with that of the monks, he says: "These latter voluntarily endure the oftentimes heavy yoke of the Lord which is laid on them. Take then upon yourselves, as he himself bids you, the light and easy yoke, and ye shall, even as they, be blessed, albeit in a way corresponding to your stage of perfection."[1] But he was profoundly sensible also of the corruption which beset the monachism of his times, as we have shown in the preceding remarks. Monachism was, in his opinion, designed as a means for the religious and moral education of the people; and the monasteries should be seats also of literary culture. He called upon the stylites to avail themselves of the general reverence in which they were held, at a time when men of all ranks and degrees of education, husbands and wives from all quarters, flocked to them, to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded of imparting to them such knowledge and advice on the matters of salvation as each might require. "With these," says he, in an admonitory discourse addressed to a stylite in Thessalonica,[2] "the stylite will hold intercourse in the right, to say all in a word, in the apostolical way; for he becomes all things to all men, that he may win all for the glory of God. And," putting him on his guard against opposite errors, "he will neither improperly flatter, lest he falsify the truth, nor will he be violent against all, lest he be accused of unseasonable freedom. For all the gifts which may be presented to him, he will be only a channel by which they are communicated to others, to the poor." He complains of those monks, who boasted of knowing no other trinity than devotion in the church, in the cell, and at the table; and those who were not aware that this was not enough for the genuine monk in order to perfection of virtue, but that he also stood greatly in need of knowledge —"And that, not only of things divine," says he, "but also of history and various other kinds of culture, by means of which he may be useful to those who approach him."[3] At all times, however, he declared strongly against the over-valuation of externals; as elsewhere, so also in monachism. Thus, for instance, to a stylite, girt with iron, he says,[4] "I desire to see on thee also the armor and other panoply of the great Paul. The outward iron avails nothing towards making him who wears it invulnerable, if he throws aside that apostolical armor. Nay, without that, it serves only to draw down the man's spirit to the earth, and to impede its flight upward. Such iron is in itself neither salutary nor hurtful; but it may

[1] Orat. ii, in Ps. 48, § 14, p. 10: *αἴρουσιν κατ' ἐκείνους, ἀναλόγως μέντοι, εὐλογη ἐθελούσιοι ἐκεῖνοι τὸν τοῦ κυρίου ζυγὸν, ὑήσεσθε καὶ αὐτοί.*
ἔστιν οὐ βαρὺν, αὐτοῖς ἐπικείμενον· ἐπὶ ὑμ-
οίῳ φόρτῳ ἄρατε ὑμεῖς τὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐκεῖ-
νος ἔφη, ἐλαφρὸν καὶ χρησιὸν. καὶ οὕτω

[2] xxii, § 66. p. 193.

[3] On the improvement of the monastic life, xxiv, § 146, p. 250.

[4] xxii, p. 186.

be either. It has sometimes become the one and sometimes the other, according to the bent of the will." Love he declares to be, for all Christians alike, the central point of the Christian life. "Only obtain this, and the whole troop of the other virtues will follow in its train. As it is the beginning of all good, it will call forth all good in you. Pronounce but the word love, and you have named at once all goodness. If love enters the soul, the whole band of the other virtues enters along with it. But if she be excluded, the soul is manifestly left naked of all good."[1] "Not so much depends on the frequent bowing of the knee," says he, in one of his sermons,[2] "but a great deal upon what is signified by that outward sign, prostration of the spirit, humility of heart before God. To stand erect was not less acceptable to God than to bow the knee; nay, it was more in harmony with nature, more consonant with activity."[3] To persons who complained that they wanted the gift of tears, he says, they should not feel pained about that. Charity shown to the poor would fully supply its place.[4]

The rage for dogmatizing among the Greek emperors had, from the earliest times, been the cause of many checks and disorders in the Greek church; and the same thing proved true under Manuel Comnenus, who reigned from 1143 to 1180. The historian Nicetas Choniates, was doubtless right in saying, the Roman emperors were not satisfied to rule, and to deal with freemen as with slaves; but they took it quite amiss, if they were not also recognized as wise and infallible dogmatists, as lawgivers, called to decide on matters human and divine.[5] The Byzantine spirit, which tolerated the emperors in this, characteristically expresses itself in these words of the historian Johannes Cinnamos: "To speculate on God's essence, is a thing allowable to none but teachers, the most considerable of the priests, *and perhaps also to the emperors on account of their dignity.*"[6] It is characteristic of the Byzantine emperors, that they took it amiss when the epithet "holy" was not applied to them as the anointed of God.[7]

That tendency, which had called forth the fanatical attachment to the word *θεοτόκος* in the Greek church, continued still to be active there; and it ever found a welcome admission among emperors, who, in proportion as they neglected to form and prove their lives by the teachings of Christ, seemed the more to imagine that they could honor him by zeal for such empty formularies. Thus, for example, the emperor Manuel Comnenus stirred up a violent controversy about the following formula: The incarnate God, in the sacrifice of Christ, was at once the offerer and the victim.[8] This formula,[9] to which the em-

[1] xi, § 7, p. 62: *αὕτη, ὅσα καὶ ἀρχὴ, ἅπασαν ἀγαθοπραξίαν ἐν ὑμὶν ἐκφανεῖ. οὐκ ἔφθη τις ἀγαπην εἰπεῖν καὶ συνεξεφωνήθη αὐτῇ ξύμπαν καλόν. ἀγάπης παρεισδυομένης εἰς ψυχὴν, συνεισέρχεται καὶ λοιπὸς ἅπας ὅμιλος ἀρετῶν. εἰ δε αὐτὴ ἐκεῖθεν ἐκκέκλεισται, δήλον, ὅτι ἔρημος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ*

[2] ii, on Ps. 48, p. 11.

[3] *καὶ φυσικώτερον ὰμα καὶ ἐνεργέστερον καὶ πρακτικώτερον.*

[4] § 14, p. 10.

[5] The remark of this historian in speaking of Manuel Comnenus, lib. vii, c. v.

[6] Lib. vi, c. ii.

[7] *τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ σύνηθες ἐχειν ὡς χρισθέντας μόνῳ τῶν βασιλέϊς.* Pachymeres de Michaële Palæologo, lib. vi, c. xxxi, p. 507.

[8] *τὸν σεσαρκωμένον θεὸν προφορεῖν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ προφορεσθαι.* Nicet. Choniat. Manuel Comnen. lib. vii, c. v.

[9] The opponent of it was the Diaco-

peror had taken a fancy, must be adopted by all. A synod convened at Constantinople drove the matter through;[1] and many of the bishops, who resisted it, were deposed from their seats. At a subsequent period he was led back again to this favorite thought, by one who had acquired great authority as a man of learning and a dialectician, and had often been employed on embassies to the West. This was Demetrius. He had accused the Occidentals of error, because they taught that the Son of God was inferior to the Father, and yet equal to him. But Manuel took part with the Occidentals, maintaining that most assuredly this might be said of the God-man, in virtue of the twofold relation in which he must be considered.[2] And in evidence, he cited Christ's words, "My Father is greater than I!" which he said as God-man, as one in two natures. And thus the controversy turned upon the interpretation of these words. It is a melancholy sign of deadness in the Greek church, that the controversy on the question whether these words should be referred to Christ according to his divine or according to his human nature, or to both at the same time, was waged as long and as vehemently, as if the salvation of souls were depending on this point.[3] And not merely bishops, but statesmen and courtiers, and finally laymen of all ranks, took sides in the dispute; and the scenes were renewed which were witnessed in the fourth century.[4] The emperor required that *his* explanation of these words, according to which they referred to the entire God-man, in virtue of his human nature, should be adopted by all. Those who would not submit to this, drew upon themselves his displeasure, and at last he forced the matter through at an *endemic synod* (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*) held under his own presidency at Constantinople in 1166, before which he caused to be laid many extracts from the church fathers, and in the transactions of which he himself took an active part.[5] The bishops, who would not receive this doctrine, were threatened with deposition; persons of the higher ranks, with the loss of their dignities and the confiscation of their goods; the rest, with banishment from the residential city. The emperor is even said[6] to have issued an edict in confirmation of these decrees, denouncing the punishment of death on those who dared oppose them; and a stone tablet which contained these determinations was set up in the church of St. Sophia.

Towards the end of the reign of Manuel, another controversy was stirred up by him in the Greek church; to which, also, an undue im-

nus Soterich. See his explication of the form published in a programme by Prof. Tafel, A. D. 1832, p. 10.

[1] The transactions of the same synod in the programme just mentioned of Prof. Tafel, p. 18.

[2] This first beginning of the dispute is recorded by Johannes Cinnamos, lib. vi, c. ii.

[3] See Nicet. Choniat. lib. vii, c. v, p. 276, seqq.

[4] The general interest taken in this controversy is noticed in the introduction to the Acts of the council held on this subject at Constantinople, under Manuel Comnenus: *ταῦτα εἶχον καὶ λεωφόροι καὶ στενωποὶ καὶ οἶκοι περιλαλούμενα.* Maji Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, t. iv, p. 4. Romae, 1831.

[5] See the above-mentioned Acts of the same.

[6] According to the account of Nicetas.

portance was ascribed. The church books at Constantinople contained the form of an oath, couched in very unsuitable language, we admit, for those who came over from Mohammedanism to the Christian faith. "Anathema to Mohammed's God, of whom he says that he neither begat nor was begotten."[1] But perhaps this formula had never as yet given that scandal to any one which the emperor thought proper to discover in it. He believed that it contained a blasphemy; for by it the anathema was pronounced on God himself; and in the breasts of Mohammedans who came over to Christianity, it would excite scruples against the Christian faith. He proposed, therefore, at an endemic synod, convened under the presidency of Theodosius, bishop of Constantinople, the abrogation of this formula. But he was unable, on this occasion, to carry his point. It was maintained against him, that the God of Mohammed was plainly not the true God. He was not to be balked, however, by failing of his object here. With the assistance of some of his court-clergy,[2] he drew up a wordy edict against the above-mentioned form of oath. But this met again with violent opposition from the patriarch and the bishops, which excited great indignation in the emperor. Determined to carry his point at any cost, he summoned the patriarch, with a synod, to his palace in Scutari, to which he had retired on account of his health. When they arrived, the emperor's secretary handed them an edict of the emperor against the formula, which he required them to sign, and an extremely violent document, in which he declared he should be ungrateful to the King of kings, to whom he was bound by so many obligations, if he suffered him to lie under the anathema; and, following a common practice of the Byzantine emperors, he threatened that he would apply to the pope, expecting to frighten the bishops to compliance. He said he would assemble a larger synod and call in the pope's assistance. At this juncture, the venerable Eustathius stood forth, holding it to be his duty, as a shepherd, to declare firmly against the imperial edict. "He could not," he said, "look upon the God of that Mohammed, from whom so much mischief had come, as the true God." When this was reported to the emperor, he fell into a paroxysm of anger. He demanded that Eustathius should be impeached. Either he who had dared to injure the Lord's anointed must be punished, or it must be proved against himself that he had never worshipped the true God, and, in that case, he would willingly allow himself to be converted. It was with the greatest difficulty that the patriarch could appease the emperor; and after much negotiation a middle course was finally

[1] See Nicetas de Comneno, lib. vii, c. vi. The words added, *καὶ ὅτι ὁλόσφυρός ἐστι*, are attended with difficulty. It was even at that time confessed, as Nicetas shows, that it could not be exactly understood what was meant: *ἄλλως δὲ μὴ συνιέναι ἀκριβῶς ὁποῖόν τέ ἐστι τὸ ὁλόσφυρον*. The last word denotes that which is solid, firm, or wrought of such materials and made of one piece; thus Pliny, Hist. Nat. lib. xxxiii, c. xxvi, employs the word holosphyratos to signify a statue of this sort cast in metal. Perhaps the allusion is to the stone in the Kaaba at Mecca, which the Mohammedans were accused of worshipping. Vide Hottinger, Hist. oriental. p. 156.

[2] As Nicetas says: *ὑπουργοῖς εἰς τοῦτο χρησάμενος, οὓς ἦδει τῶν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείου αὐλῆς τὸν καιρὸν κολακεύοντας*

agreed upon, and it was determined that, in place of the anathema against the God of Mohammed, should be substituted the certainly more judicious form: "against Mohammed, and his doctrine, and everything connected therewith."[1]

In respect to the relation of the Greek church to the Latin, the after-effects of those schisms which had made their appearance at an earlier period still continued to be experienced. The systematic evolution of the system of faith of the Roman church, by scholasticism, and the perfected form of papal absolutism, could only serve to define more sharply the line of division between the two churches, and to make the difference still more radical. While they on the side of the Roman church, in their consciousness of possessing the only true tradition, and an authority founded on divine right, and destined to judge and decide over all, supposed they could look down on the Greek church with a feeling of superiority; they of the Greek church, priding themselves on a traditional literary culture, which, to be sure, must fade to insignificance when compared with the new mental achievements of the West, were still inclined to despise the Latins as barbarians. The crusades brought Greeks and Latins into closer connection and more living contact with each other; but these were frequently but sources of controversy and distrust, and served rather to widen than to narrow the distance between the two parties. As we have already remarked on a former page,[2] the disputed question prevailing between the two churches, concerning the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, was brought up anew for discussion at the beginning of these undertakings, in 1098, before a council held by pope Urban the Second, at Bari. Anselm of Canterbury stood forth as advocate of the Latin church doctrine, and the anathema on that of the Greek church was here renewed.

Among the succeeding transactions between the two churches, one particularly deserving notice was a conference held under the Greek emperor John Comnenus the Second, between Anselm of Havelberg,[3] a bishop eminently distinguished for weight of character, intellectual ability, and education, and the archbishop Nechites (doubtless Nicetas) of Nicomedia, who superintended the direction of studies already noticed, at Constantinople, in 1146, on the questions in dispute between the two churches, and the means of settling them. When Anselm, at a subsequent period, was residing at the court of pope Eugene the Third, he drew up, at the request of that pope, a full account of that conference.[4] We may take it for granted, indeed, that we are not presented here with a set of minutes drawn up with diplomatical accuracy; still, we have every reason to presume that the mode in which the Greek prelate managed his cause in this conference, has, in all essential respects, been truly represented by Anselm. He

[1] Ἀνάθημα τῷ Μωάμετ καὶ πασῃ τῇ αὐτοῦ διδαχῇ καὶ διαδοχῇ.

[2] Page 458.

[3] See, respecting him, A. F. Riedel's Essay, in the Allgemeinen Archiv, für die Geschichtskunde des preussischen Staates von L. von Ledebur, vol. viii, f. 97; and by Dr. Spieker, in Illgen's Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, vol. ii, f. 1840.

[4] In D'Achery Spiceleg. t. i.

represents him as saying many pointed and striking things against the Latin church, such as he, assuredly, could not have invented at his own point of view, and would not have put into the mouth of his opponent.

In respect to the contested point in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Nicetas appealed, as the Greeks were ever wont to do, to the passage in the gospel of St. John, and to the inviolable authority of the Nicene creed. Anselm replied conformably with the doctrine of the church, as it had been settled since the time of Vincentius of Lerins. He presented, on the other side, the progressive evolution of that doctrine, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, actuating the church, by virtue of which the doctrine, contained as to its germ in the sacred Scriptures, had been more exactly defined and explicated, and what it contained in spirit, reduced to the form of more precise conceptions; just as the work of one universal council is completed in the gradual development of Christian doctrine by another and later. All this is the work of the same Spirit, promised by Christ to his disciples and to his church; of whom he says that he would teach many things which the apostles, at that time, could not understand. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, as explained by the council of Nice, the doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, cannot be pointed out as a doctrine expressed, in so many words, in the Bible.[1] Anselm alleged, in behalf of the well-grounded authority of the Roman church, that all heresies had found their birthplace in the Greek church; while in the former, the pure doctrine had ever been preserved, free from alloy, amid all the disputes proceeding from that other quarter. To this Nicetas replied:[2] "If the heresies had sprung up in the Greek church, still, they were subdued there; and they could only contribute to the clearer evolution and stronger confirmation of the faith." And he endeavors to point out, here, a substantial advantage of the Greek church over the Latin, tracing it to the predominating scientific culture which had distinguished the Greek church from the beginning. "Perhaps the very reason why so many heresies had not sprung up among the Romans was, that there had not been among them so many learned and acute investigators of the sacred Scriptures. If that conceit of knowledge by which the Greek heretics had been misled, deserved censure, still, the ignorance of the Latins, who affirmed neither one thing nor another about the faith, but only followed the lead of others in unlearned simplicity, deserved not to be praised.[3] It must be ascribed either to blamable negligence in examining into the faith, or to singular inactivity of mind and dulness of apprehension, or to hindrances growing out of the heavy load of secular business."[4] He applies to the Latins, in this regard, the words in 1 Tim. 1: 7, and to the Greeks what Aristotle says of the usefulness of doubt as a passage-

[1] Lib. ii, c. xxii, seqq.

[2] Lib. iii, c. xi.

[3] Lib. iii, c. xi: Sicut haereticorum, qui apud nos fuerunt, vana sapientia, qua seducti sunt, culpanda est, ita nimirum [which, without doubt, should read minime, as irony here would be out of place] laudanda est Romana imperitia, qua ipsi nec hoc nec illud de fide dixerunt, sed alios inde dicentes et docentes simplicitate quasi minus docta audierunt.

[4] Quod contigisse videtur vel ex nimia negligentia investigandae fidei vel ex grossa tarditate hebetis ingenii vel ex occupatione ac mole saecularis impedimenti.

way to truth.[1] Earnestly does Nicetas protest against the intimation, that the Greek church might be compelled to adopt what the pope, without a council held in concurrence with the Greeks, might, on his own self-assumed authority, prescribe. "If the pope, seated on the high throne of his glory, will fulminate against us, and hurl down his mandates upon us from his lofty station; if, not with our concurrence, but arbitrarily, and according to his own good pleasure, he will judge us, nay, order us; what fraternal or what paternal relation can subsist long on such terms? Who would patiently endure this? If we could, we might justly be called, and should be in fact, slaves, and not sons of the church."[2] He then goes on to say that, if such authority belonged to the pope, then all study of the Scriptures, and of the sciences, all Greek intellect and Greek learning, were superfluous. The pope alone would be bishop, teacher, and pastor; he alone would have to be responsible to God for all, whom God had committed to his charge alone. The apostolic creed did not teach men to acknowledge a Roman church in especial, but one common, catholic, apostolic church.[3]

Though Nicetas defended the use of ordinary bread in the celebration of the Lord's supper, a custom which had always been handed down in the Greek church, yet he estimates the importance of this disputed point with Christian moderation.[4] He says that he himself, in case no other bread was to be had, would have no hesitation in using unleavened bread in the mass. "Since, however," he adds, "the number of the narrow-minded far exceeds that of persons well-instructed in the faith, and the undistinguishing multitude easily take offence, it was worthy of all pains, that both Latins and Greeks should be induced to join, heart and hand, in bringing about, in some suitable place and at some suitable time, a general council, at which the use of leavened or unleavened bread, by all at the same time, should be adopted; or, if such an agreement could not be arrived at without giving scandal to one of the two parties, yet all should agree in this, that neither party should condemn the other, and this difference should no longer turn to the injury of holy charity. "Mutual condemnation," says he, "is a far greater sin than this diversity of custom, which was in itself a matter of indifference." Both finally agreed on this point, that a general council, consisting of Latins and Greeks, for the purpose of bringing about a reunion of the two churches, was a thing greatly to be desired.

But the irritable state of feeling between the two parties, heightened by the crusades and the consequences following in their train, and the arrogant pretensions of the popes, who would not lower their tone, put the assembling of such a council out of the question; and even if it

[1] See the passage cited from Abelard, above, p. 392.

[2] Si Romanus pontifex in excelso throno gloriae suae residens nobis tonare et quasi projicere mandata sua de sublimi voluerit, et non nostro consilio, sed proprio arbitrio pro beneplacito suo de nobis et de ecclesiis nostris judicare, imo imperare voluerit, quae fraternitas seu etiam quae paternitas haec esse poterit? Quis hoc unquam aequo animo sustinere queat? Tunc nempe veri servi et non filii ecclesiae recte dici possemus et esse.

[3] Lib. iii, c. viii.

[4] Lib. c. c. xviii.

could have been held, it must, for the same reasons, have failed of coming to any beneficial results. When afterwards, in the twelfth century, several provinces of the East were conquered by the crusaders, when finally, in 1204, a Western empire was founded at Constantinople, the Latins conducted towards the Greeks in so unchristian, despotic, and cruel a manner that the hate of the latter was thereby roused to a higher intensity, and the impression endured for a long time afterwards. Every violent measure was resorted to for the purpose of subjecting all to the church of Rome, and of suppressing everything peculiar to the Greeks. The monks especially were treated with great harshness. Many Greeks died as martyrs at the stake, for the liberties of their church, and the honest convictions of their minds.[1]

Though by these events the Greeks must have become still more alienated from the Roman church, and the transactions on the island of Cyprus and at Constantinople had left an indelible impression on the minds of the Greek clergy, yet a new political interest came into play, which made the Greek emperors, who had taken up their residence at Nice, more desirous than ever of the union of the two churches. The emperor John Ducas Vatazes hoped, by the mediation of the pope, that he should be able to recover what had been rent from the empire by the arms of the Latins; and for this reason invited and favored negotiations for union. The patriarch Germanus of Constantinople, but who also resided at Nice, sent two letters to pope Gregory the Ninth, and to the cardinals, which certainly betray no evidence in him of a man who could have been induced by any political considerations to bow before the papacy.[2] The patriarch begins with saying that he regarded Christ as the only true corner-stone, on which the whole church was founded: "Whoever believes on thee, as this corner-stone," he exclaims,—addressing Christ, and probably alluding already to the exclusive pretensions of the church of Rome,—"shall in no-wise come to shame, nor find himself torn from the foundation of his hope. This truth none can gainsay but a disciple of the father of lies." As Christ proclaims peace to those who are nigh, and to those who are afar off, as by his death on the cross he had brought together all, from the utmost bounds of the earth, into a fellowship of piety, so it was his own cause to bring back those who had fallen apart to

[1] See the report of an unknown Greek particularly concerning the cruelties perpetrated on the island of Cyprus, in the work of Leo Allatius, a Greek who had gone over to the Roman church: De ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione, lib. ii, c. xiii, p. 694. To this learned man such proceedings of the Romish church seem perfectly regular, and he very naïvely remarks: Opus erat, effraenes provinciaeque fidei rebelles et veritatis oppugnatores non exilio, sed ferro et igne in sanioremem mentem reducere. Haeretici proscribendi sunt, exterminandi sunt, puniendi sunt et pertinaces occidendi, cremandi. Ita leges sanciunt, ita observavit antiquitas, nec alius mos est recentioris ecclesiae tum Graecae tum Latinae.

[2] These two letters, published by Matthew of Paris, at the year 1237, f. 386. Nothing but the bias of party-interest could ever lead one to hold that these letters are a fabrication, on the ground of the violent passages in them directed against the popes; Gregory's answer shows that many passages of that sort must have been in the letter to which he is replying; besides, what took place subsequently, during the negotiations at Constantinople, testifies to the existence of such a tone of feeling as is expressed in these letters.

the unity of faith. He then urgently calls upon the pope to make every effort for the restoration of church-fellowship between Greeks and Latins. He defends the Greeks against the objections made to their orthodoxy; against the complaints that they were the authors of the schism: "Many persons of high dignity and power," says he, "would listen to you, were they not afraid of unjust oppressions, wanton extortions, or indecorous servitude." Only one thing was wanting to the Greeks, the blood and crown of martyrdom: "What I say, and why I say it," he then exclaims, "the famous island of Cyprus can tell, which has furnished new martyrs. Was that a pretty business, most holy pope, successor of the apostle Peter? Did Peter, the gentle and humble disciple of Christ, prescribe that?" And he held up to the pope the doctrine set forth in the first epistle of Peter; while to the Greeks he applies what the same apostle says of the faith that is tried by the fire of sufferings. He concludes with again entreating the pope that he would spare no pains in bringing about the great work of restoring unity to the church, as he himself would not be hindered by any bodily weakness, any infirmity of old age, from doing all that lay within his power. He said: "He was well aware that both parties maintained the error was not with them, which each would of course say of itself. But both parties should look into the mirror of the sacred Scriptures, and of the writings left behind them by the old church teachers, and thereby examine themselves." The same spirit also expressed itself in the letter written by the patriarch to the cardinals: "Let us all," said he to them, "be of the same mind. Let not one of us say: I am of Paul; another, I am of Apollos; another, I am of Cephas; another, I am of Christ, but let us all call ourselves of Christ, as we are all called Christians." Here, too, the rending of the unity of the church was attributed to the extortions and oppressive measures of the church of Rome: "From being a mother, she had turned into a step-mother; unmindful of the words of our Lord, that he who humbleth himself shall be exalted, she trampled most under foot those who humbled themselves the most before her." The pope hereupon sent two Dominicans and two Franciscans to Constantinople, as delegates to treat concerning peace, — with two letters to the patriarch, in which he took notice of the reproaches thrown out in the above-cited letters, but also passed by many things, perhaps purposely, in silence. He allowed that the patriarch was right, in saying that Christ is the chief corner-stone and first foundation of the church; but reminded him that the apostles were the secondary foundations (*secundaria fundamenta*), among whom the first and most important was the apostle Peter, of whose primacy he was careful to remind him. The envoys, on their arrival at Constantinople, in 1233, were received with great marks of honor; but the negotiations, in which the Greeks betrayed the irritated state of their feelings at the wrongs they had suffered, led to no favorable results. The legates declared that the Roman church would not depart an *iota* from their faith and symbol; the Greeks must confess to the faith that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as from

the Father; and they must set forth this in their sermons before the people, and condemn and burn their books written against this doctrine. On the other hand, however, the pope would not force them to recite the creed with that addition. Neither should the use of unleavened bread, in the Lord's supper, be pressed on the Greeks; only they should firmly believe and preach to others that the body of Christ could be made of unleavened as well as leavened bread, and all the books composed against that usage of the Roman church they should condemn and burn. These last declarations were received by the emperor, and by the bishops, with great indignation; and so the negotiations were broken up.[1]

If the restoration of fraternal communion between the two great portions of the church, which together were designed to form one whole, might itself be an object of longing desire to all who were not blinded by national hate, or narrow-minded fanaticism, much more must the great evils which sprang out of the schism, and continued to be propagated and to spring up afresh from age to age, call forth in the unprejudiced the wish for a reunion, and impel them to cast about for the means of securing so great an object. And when such persons inquired into the points of dispute which had come into discussion between the two parties, these, most assuredly, would appear to them as of little or no importance in their relation to the interests of the Christian faith; for the far graver doctrinal opposition betwixt the two churches had in fact remained an unconscious one, never expressed in any public confession. In the controverted point which was considered of the most weight,—the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost,—an easy method of accommodation readily presented itself, that of resorting to a comparison of the older church teachers. Accordingly, a pious and learned man of these times, standing in high veneration among the Greeks, the abbot and priest Nicephorus Blemmydes devoted himself to the business of writing for the peace of the church,[2] which he was induced to do by a purely Christian interest, separate from all those other considerations which under these circumstances are so apt to mingle in.

He was one of the few who did not cringe before the Byzantine despotism, as we may see from the following example: The emperor John Ducas kept up an illicit intercourse with Marcesina, a lady of the court, with whose beauty he had become enamored. He treated her as a second wife, and required nearly the same honors to be paid to her as to an empress. The pious monk whom we have mentioned, was the only one who fearlessly expressed himself, both in writing and conversation, against this scandal offered to a Christian people; and once, when she proposed visiting the church connected with the monastery of Blemmydes, and to partake of the communion there, he caused the church doors to be shut in her face. Accustomed to receive homage from all, she was the more exasperated at receiving this treat-

[1] See the account of the papal legates in Rainaldi, A. D. 1233, § 5, et seq.

[2] See two treatises relating to this subject, in Leo Allatius Græcia orthodoxa, t. i.

ment from a monk, and urged the emperor, over whom in other matters her influence was unbounded, to revenge her insulted pride. The worthy monk, foreseeing the vengeance that must overtake him, issued a circular letter,[1] giving an account of what he had done, explaining the reasons which had led him to do so, and expressing the noble temper which governed him.[2] "Though by this sudden and unexpected appearance," says he, "we were taken by surprise, yet we did not for a moment hesitate to drive away from the common prayer and song of the faithful, the adulteress, who, in an unheard-of manner, insults the laws of Christ and makes the insult a public one, and to banish with all our power the unholy from holy places; not without fear, indeed, owing to the weakness of the flesh, but overcoming the fear of man by the fear of the Lord, so that we would rather die than act contrary to his laws. Though many," he wrote, "might think differently from himself, yet he could not follow them in that which is wrong. He should stand ready even to renounce the fathers, that he might be only a disciple of Christ, and to keep himself wholly in his footsteps and laws. Whoever was not so minded could not be Christ's disciple." And he concluded with these words: "Thus thinking, we dared not present the holy bread to the impure and shameless, and to cast the pearls of the liturgy before one who wallows in the mire of adultery. Therefore will we suffer in the Lord, whatever may betide us."[3]

But the emperor, restrained by the voice of his conscience, did not venture to attempt anything against the pious man who was in earnest for the honor of the divine law.[4] Under the emperor Theodore Lascaris the Second, the dignity of patriarch of Constantinople was offered to this Blemmydes, but he preferred the quiet of his monastery.[5]

The above-mentioned reason, which led the emperors residing in Nice to wish for the union of the churches, was removed, it is true, when in 1261 Michael Paleologus, by his crimes, had risen to the imperial dignity,— and by crimes sought to maintain himself in it,— reconquered Constantinople, and restored the ancient empire. But on the other hand, the political motives inducing him to seek the restoration of a good understanding with the pope, became the stronger. He stood in fear of the armies of the West, which were again threatening the Greek empire, and hoped, through means of the pope, to be able to avert this danger. He was ready himself to make any sacrifice for this object, and felt assured, not without reason, that the papacy, even though submitted to, must always remain a powerless thing to the Greek church, and the subjection be merely one of form and appearance. But he could not so easily succeed in making the heads of the clergy and of the monks feel the force of these considerations, and

[1] *ἐπιστολὴ καθολικωτέρα.*

[2] Of Marcesina he says: *ὅτε ἡ ἀρχοντίσσα ἡ Μαρκεσίνα, ἡ ἐξόχως ἐρωμένη τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πάντων ὑπερτεροῦσα καὶ αὐτὴς τῆς Λὐγούστης πρωτεύουσα τυραννικῶς εἰσέφρησεν*, etc.

[3] Vide Leo Allat. de ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consens., lib. ii, c. xiv, p. 718.

[4] See the historical work of Nicephorus Gregoras, lib. ii, c. vii.

[5] L. c lib. iii, c. i.

share these convictions with himself. Great as was the power of the rude Byzantine despotism over the minds of its subjects, still, it was opposed on this side by a formidable check, which brute force could not so easily remove; and there subsisted already in the Greek church a schism, for which this emperor was accountable, and which might easily be followed up by another still more radical, to increase the confusion.

When, under the reign of Theodore Lascaris the Second, Nicephorus Blemmydes declined the patriarchal dignity offered to him, another pious monk, Arsenius, was induced to accept it, though he was afterwards constrained to lament that he had not followed the example of the first-named individual. That emperor left behind him, at his death, a son six years old, over whom he appointed the patriarch guardian; and the latter felt himself sacredly bound to watch over the young heir of the empire, till he could enter upon the government. It being out of his power to prevent Michael Paleologus from usurping the supreme authority, he crowned him; yet only on the express condition that he bound himself, by a solemn oath, to hold the government no longer than to the majority of John Lascaris, and then to resign in his favor. But that usurper refused to be bound by his oath; and the more effectually to exclude from the throne the regular successor of the late emperor, and to secure himself against all danger from his plots, he caused John Lascaris, who was now a child about ten years old, to be deprived of his eyesight. The patriarch Arsenius immediately excommunicated him; and the emperor, though he might silence the upbraidings of his own conscience at the commission of so great a crime, and forget the judgment of a holy God, yet dreaded the tribunal of the church. The absolution of the church was, to him, the same as the forgiveness of sin. A stranger to all true fear of God, the despot humbled himself before the tribunal of the church. Submitting to the penance imposed on him, he expected thus to gain over the patriarch so as to induce him to remove the ban and grant him absolution. Thus would he make the matter up with his own conscience and the judgment of God. But he could not bend the mind of the pious patriarch. The only course that remained, therefore, was to get rid of him. A synod called together at Constantinople was the instrument employed to subvert him, and he cheerfully retired once more to the seclusion and quiet of the cloister. A bishop of Adrianople, Germanus, who was friendly to the emperor, was appointed his successor. Still, a large party remained devoted to Arsenius, and refused to recognize any other as patriarch. Germanus found himself assailed by reproaches on all sides, and resigned his office. Joseph, an aged and unlettered monk, wholly ignorant of the world, finally assumed the patriarchal dignity. In the midst of a large convocation of bishops, the emperor, after the celebration of the mass, prostrated himself at the foot of the altar, and declared himself guilty of two sins, perjury, and depriving the son of his predecessor of his eyesight. Then the patriarch first stood up and gave the emperor, while prostrate on the ground, a written certificate of the forgiveness

of his sins, and the bishops, one after the other, in the order of their rank, read to him this form of absolution. The emperor, after partaking of the communion, departed, joyful, as if the burden had been removed from his conscience, and he were now made sure of the grace of God himself.[1] Nor did he forget how much he was indebted for the peace of his soul to the patriarch Joseph. The new patriarch, however, was but the more detested by the party of Arsenius; and the schism betwixt the Arsenians and the followers of Joseph penetrated into the midst of families.[2]

Although the attempt to effect a union between the two churches, would unavoidably create new divisions in the Greek church already rent by these parties, still, the dread of the storm which threatened him from the West caused the emperor to overlook all other difficulties. The motives which influenced Michael Paleologus were sustained and reinforced by the fact that in 1271,[3] an individual who on his return from the East had taken pains accurately to inform himself of the emperor's situation, who took a lively interest in the renewal of the crusades, and considered the reconciliation of the Greeks and Latins a very important means to that end, Gregory the Tenth, was elected pope. It was the determination of this pope to make it his special business at the general council, which was to assemble in 1274, to set on foot a new crusade, and consequently to bring up the subject of the union. When the Roman embassy for peace, in which John Parastron, a man of Greek descent, especially distinguished himself by his zeal for the cause, arrived at Constantinople, the emperor exerted himself to the utmost to hasten the business to a conclusion. He described to the clergy the threatening danger which might thus be averted. He appealed to the negotiations already mentioned, under the emperor Johannes Ducas, when the Latins were by no means accused of impiety on account of their doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and it was by no means required that their addition to this doctrine should be expunged from all other writings, but only from the creed. He represented to them, that the Latins and Greeks agreed as nearly together on the most important matters of faith, as if the difference between them was only a difference of language. There needed to be no scruples about admitting the name of the pope into the ecclesiastical books (*δίπτυχα*), and of mentioning him in the public prayers of the church, since the same thing was done in the case of bishops of far inferior dignity, as a mark of church-fellowship. Why should there be any hesitation about calling the pope brother and first brother, when even the rich man in torments did not hesitate to call Abraham father, from whom he was separated by that great gulf which indicated an opposition of temper. Even though the right of appeals to the pope were sanctioned, still, owing to the wide separation by sea, the

[1] The words of the historian Nicephorus Gregoras, lib. iv, c. viii: *καὶ οὕτως ἀπῆει χαίρων ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὁμοῦ τῇ τοιαύτῃ συγχωρήσει καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἵλεων αὐτῷ καταστῆναι οἰόμενος.* George Pachymeres's history of this emperor's reign, lib. iv, c. xxv.

[2] Pachymeres's History, lib. iv, c. xxviii.

[3] See above, p. 188.

thing could not easily be carried out in practice.[1] The patriarch Joseph, who was otherwise inclined to compliance, and whom the emperor was disposed to indulge out of gratitude for the absolution he had obtained from him, offered here the most determined resistance, being fully under the influence of the common sentiment which prevailed in the Greek church. Not having sufficient confidence in his own learning, he requested his archivarius (*χαρτοφύλαξ*) Johannes Beccus,[2] a man of high authority on account of his knowledge in church literature, and his rhetorical gifts, after the Byzantine standard, that he would give a public expression of his judgment on these matters. Fear held him back. But when the patriarch bade him speak on penalty of the ban, he at length surmounted his fears, and in direct terms declared the Latins to be heretics. This was of great weight on the side of the party whom he led. The concentrated fury of the emperor now fell upon him; he was thrown with his whole family into prison, and the emperor, who considered it a matter of the greatest consequence to gain his voice, employed this treatment as a means also of bending his will and inducing him to alter his tone. For the purpose of gaining him over, extracts from the older church-teachers were laid before him in his dungeon. He desired to read the excerpted passages in their connection, and the emperor readily consented. He was permitted to leave his prison, so as to be able to consult himself all the books he thought necessary. One might be disposed to think, from the way in which the change in Beccus's opinions was brought about, that it was merely a hypocritical pretence. Yet his later behavior, the fidelity with which he adhered, under every change of circumstances, to the principles once expressed by him, evidence that he was not one of those whose views are determined by extraneous considerations. And the writings subsequently composed by him in defence of the union, speak the language of conviction, and lead us to infer how the change must have been brought about in him, though we might be inclined to suppose that the outward circumstances also exercised an unconscious influence. His first violent declaration might have proceeded from the passion which he shared in common with the other zealots of the Greek church, before he had made any exact inquiry into the contested points. Now he had leisure and quiet to think over the great evils which had been wrought by the schism and the violent opposition of the two parties, to weigh more

[1] See the report of George Pachymeres, who himself took a part in these proceedings, in his history of this emperor, lib. v, c. xii.

[2] The two historians, Nicephorus Gregoras and Pachymeres, do not entirely agree with each other in their judgment about the learning of Beccus. The former says (lib. v, c. ii, p. 129, in the latest collection): in the knowledge of Hellenic literature, others had gone before him; but in the *ἀσκησις δογμάτων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*, all appeared as children in comparison with him. The other remarks, that he busied himself so much with Hellenic literature that he could not make himself so well acquainted with ecclesiastical. Vide lib. v, p. 381. Perhaps he excelled in the so-called gifts of discourse and dialectics, but had little knowledge of Greek literature or ecclesiastical either. If he was no great proficient in ecclesiastical learning, the change of his views on matters of ecclesiastical controversy may be more easily explained without disadvantage to his character.

exactly the points of dispute, and to compare them with the far more important articles in which both the churches were agreed. The compromise already proposed by many, in the most important point of dispute, the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, appeared to him a plain and obvious one. In particular, the writings of the venerable Nicephorus Blemmydes, writings prompted by a sincere regard for the peace of the church, but which he had never before read, seem to have produced a great effect on his mind. Thus, from being the most zealous opponent, he became by degrees the warmest supporter of the union; and in him the emperor found the most important instrument for promoting his designs, an instrument which he needed so much the more, as it was now vain to expect that he should be able to gain over the patriarch Joseph, who had bound himself by an oath. Without listening to the contradiction of the zealots for the ancient doctrine and freedom of the Greek church, Michael Paleologus was determined to push the matter through. A respectable embassy, charged with valuable presents, was sent to Rome, and so the work of union was consummated, at the council of Lyons, in 1274, after the manner prescribed by the pope. A confession answering to the faith of the church of Rome, which had respect also to the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, was accepted and read in the name of the Greek church; but to the latter was conceded the right of retaining their symbol without alteration, as well as other peculiar usages, which obtained before the schism. The primacy of the church of Rome was admitted by the Greeks. The emperor had entered into an agreement with the peace-loving patriarch Joseph, that the latter should quietly resign his patriarchate, if the work of union should be consummated at Rome. This was now done; and he hailed it as a welcome event which enabled him once more to retire to the cloister. Beccus was appointed patriarch; and Joseph being forced against his will to stand at the head of the opponents of the union, though he himself and his former archivarius cherished the same feelings towards each other as ever, Beccus was made by that party the brunt of the most violent attacks. And the measures to which the emperor resorted in order to force a recognition of the union, and punish its opponents, who might easily be represented to him as guilty of high treason, would only serve to exasperate that party and stir up their hatred against Beccus, who was certainly a great sufferer in consequence of these proceedings. Banishment from the country, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, the scourge, the cutting off of ears and noses, and putting out of eyes, these were the means which the emperor employed against the enemies of the seeming peace which he had brought about. The fanatical opponents of the union detested its advocates still more if possible than they did the Latins themselves. Their fanaticism manifested itself by their sedulously avoiding all intercourse with the other party, by which they imagined they should be polluted. Beccus had resolved, at first, to take no notice of the calumnious attacks made against himself, for he feared that the public excitement would only be increased. But he found it impossible to resist the impulse to de-

fend a cause which he considered just against accusations which appeared to him sophistical and calumnious. He felt constrained to defend the Latins against that fanatical hate, which would load them with every heresy, and allow the agreement in the essentials of faith to be utterly forgotten. He showed how the schism had been originally brought about by outward occasions and personal animosities. He endeavored to expose the groundlessness of the accusations of Photius and other old polemics.[1] He exerted himself withal to produce a spirit of greater moderation; but in the present excited state of feelings his controversial writings could only serve to pour fresh oil on the flames and to furnish new occasions for branding him as a heretic. The mania of these disputes once more penetrated into families. Laymen became zealous for differences about which they understood nothing at all, as if the very being of the Christian faith depended thereon. Those melancholy spectacles of the fourth century were repeated, when disputes on such matters were carried on in bakeshops and public baths, — a comparison made by Beccus himself, who tells us that children, women, day-laborers, peasants, people understanding nothing about the matter, raised a great clamor and outcry against every man who dared say a word in favor of the peace of the church.[2] He then cites a statement of Gregory, of Nyssa, about the Arian controversies.[3] "The same thing," he says, "I see happening nowadays almost everywhere. Boys going to school, women at the spinning-wheel, peasants, and day-laborers of all sorts, are more intent and interested, than they are upon any business under their hands, in passing judgment on those who say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son." And at the same time that he was thus attacked by the opponents of the emperor, he must run the risk of incurring that despot's displeasure by the greater nobleness of his own character. He availed himself both of the relation in which he stood to him as patriarch, and of the favor which he had won as promoter of the union, to intercede in behalf of many of the wretched victims of power. Violent altercations not seldom arose between him and the emperor, but he was often able to carry his point, and many owed to him their deliverance. Yet occasionally he failed; and the boldness with which he then spoke brought down upon him, for the moment, the monarch's displeasure. Thus it happened, that the emperor on a certain occasion refused to grant the patriarch, in spite of his repeated remonstrances, the pardon of an unfortunate individual. When Michael afterwards came to a great festival of saints, Beccus renewed his remonstrances, but with no better success than before. Then he held back the hand from which the emperor was about to receive the holy supper, declaring that he would not offer it to him in that unforgiving

[1] See the controversial writings of Beccus in the above-mentioned collection of Leo Allatius.

[2] *γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες καὶ ἄνδρες τῶν ὅλως οὐδὲν γεωργικοῦ ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς βαναύσου βίου πλέον εἰδότων μεγάλου ἐγκλήματος κρίνουσι, τοὺς μικρὸν γοῦν τι τολμῶντας ὑπογρύξαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς εἰρήνης συναίνεσιν.*

[3] See the second discourse of Beccus, respecting his unjust deposition, in Leo Allat. Graecia orthodoxa, t. ii, p. 52, seqq.

mood to his own condemnation. All the entreaties of the emperor were in vain. Ashamed and angry he left the church. Beccus withdrew from the patriarchal palace to a monastery, and the emperor was forced to recall him again from his retirement. Such scenes were ever and anon repeated. In the fourth year of his patriarchal dignity, it so happened that Beccus failed once more in his intercessions in behalf of an unfortunate person. Afterwards, on meeting the latter, he called God to witness that he had done all that lay in his power to save him. This was so interpreted by Beccus's enemies as if he had pronounced a curse on the emperor. It is said that he was impeached for high treason. He gladly resigned the patriarchal office and retired to the monastery. But as envoys from Rome arrived just at that time, to look after the state of the union in the Greek church, the emperor was obliged once more to invoke the assistance of Beccus, in order to make the embassy believe in a peace which was only a seeming one.[1] As by this union only new divisions were excited in the Greek church, the thing fell more and more into neglect on both sides. The emperor saw that he had not obtained his object, which was to keep the war away from Sicily through the mediation of Rome, and became himself more lukewarm. In Rome, too, it was understood, that nothing had been gained by the seeming union; and the papal court was no longer influenced in its conduct towards the Greeks by this idle play.—In 1281, pope Martin the Fourth actually went so far as to pronounce the ban on the emperor, and Michael, who was governed entirely by political motives, on seeing that all his plans were frustrated, would gladly have retraced all his steps, if he could have done so under any plausible pretext.

But when, in the year 1282, Andronicus succeeded his father Michael in the government, the hatred conceived by the Greek people towards that union which had been forced upon them, a hatred hitherto suppressed, broke out for that very reason with the greater violence. The new emperor, who had never been a friend to the union, followed with good will the reigning tendency of spirit; and far from being disposed, like his father, to domineer over the conscience, he desired above all things to put an end to the divisions. The fanaticism of the excited multitude prevented him from observing the funeral obsequies of his father according to the usual ecclesiastical forms. Joseph was now regarded as the regular patriarch, and he was favored also by the emperor. Beccus, who had to be protected from the popular fury, voluntarily retired to a monastery. A dignity which had caused so many painful hours, and involved him in so many uncomfortable disputes,[2] he probably laid down without regret, though he afterwards felt himself compelled to complain of the party which had put him down by arbitrary will, and to defend his good cause against the fanatics who accused him of heresy. The patriarch Joseph, now reduced by

[1] The full account of the particulars is in Pachymeres, lib. vi, c. xiv.

[2] Pachymeres says of him: *τῆς τοῦ πατριάρχου τιμῆς ἐπικόρως ἔχων, ὡς πολλάκις καὶ λέγων καὶ πράττων ἔδειξεν*

severe illness and old age to the borders of the grave, and who could not therefore be inclined either to resume such an office, or to place himself at the head of a party, was obliged, by those who pretended to act in his name and under his authority, to consent to be borne on his sick-bed into the patriarch's palace.[1] Under the patriarch's name, whose gentle temper was altogether averse to the odious practice of branding men as heretics, as well as to all other extravagant proceedings, such acts were perpetrated by the fanatical monks and clergy as he would have utterly disapproved of, but which the feeble state of his body prevented him from publicly disclaiming. All who had in any way had anything to do with the union were regarded as cut off from the fellowship of the church; and according to the part which they had taken in that measure, ecclesiastical penalties, more or less grave, in the shape of pecuniary mulcts, were imposed on them, as a condition of their readmission to church-fellowship. The walls of the churches, the sacred utensils, were looked upon as polluted, and subjected to various ceremonies of purification. But Beccus especially, though he had voluntarily withdrawn himself from the public stage of action, was made the object of hatred and persecution. It was laid to his charge that he had forcibly obtruded himself into the place of the still living, regular patriarch. He was held up to scorn as the enemy of the Greek nation and church. From his conciliatory essays men pretended to deduce a large list of heresies; and in this church, to which a theology like the scholastic theology of the Latins was foreign, such attempts to reconcile the contrary views in the mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Holy Ghost as Beccus had made by means of the dialectical formula respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father through the Son seemed offensive even to the more moderate class. It appeared to them a profane and impertinent speculation on matters which must only be adored in silence.[2] He proceeded by writings and by discourses to defend his orthodoxy, and the course of conduct he had pursued. He ever sought to show that he had given up nothing appertaining to orthodoxy, but had only allowed himself, for the sake of the peace of the church, after the example of the older church teachers, to adopt an *οἰκονομία*, a conception, to be sure, which theologians in the Greek church were in the habit of using in a very indefinite sense, even at the expense of strict veracity. The party of the zealots required that he should acknowledge his guilt, confess the legality of his deposition, furnish a written recantation, and beg forgiveness of the patriarch. When he had been forced against his will

[1] Beccus, agreeing with the historian Pachymeres, says, in the first discourse relating to his unjust deposition, c. iii, of this change: *εἰχε μεν ἡμᾶς ἡ μονή, ἡ φερουντες δεδωκαμεν ἑαυτους, ἐκεῖνον δε ἡ κλινη, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ὑρόνος, ὅτι μηδ' ἐκαθεσθη, ἀλλ' ἐτεθη ἐπὶ τον ὑρόνον.* And he adds, that he did not say this in the way of reproaching the man, but only to expose the wickedness of his enemies, who were determined, at all hazards, to depose him. Against the man, in himself considered, not a word of reproach could be cast, *τις γὰρ ὁ μωμος, ἀνὴρωπον ἐγγὺς ὂντα ὑανάτου ἀναισθητειν.*

[2] The moderate Pachymeres, who defends Beccus on many points, concurs with this way of thinking: *τα περὶ νεοῦ σωπὴ μᾶλλον ἐχειν τε καὶ τιμὰν ἢ λοιδορίας συνιστασ, καὶ δεικνυειν πεφυκεν.* The History of Andronicus, lib. i, c. viii. t. ii, p. 27.

to appear before a synod at Constantinople, and had there boldly defended himself, he at length consented to give way for the moment, to resign the patriarchal and priestly offices, to subscribe a confession of faith which had been laid before him, and to beg forgiveness of the patriarch Joseph, who was entirely ignorant of all these proceedings.[1] By this, the clamors of his enemies were for the present appeased; but only a short time elapsed before he was banished to Brussa. While here also, he took an active and zealous part in the disputes which were ever springing up afresh. Before a synod assembled in the presence of the emperor, he disputed with his opponents on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost; the boldness and violence with which he spoke in public drew down upon him the displeasure of the emperor, who had but one wish, which was to reconcile all the parties with each other. He was banished to a castle on the bay of Astacene in Bithynia, and here narrowly watched; he at first suffered from want, till the emperor became again more mildly disposed towards him. In this confinement, in which also he did not cease writing in defence of his cause, he spent fourteen years, and died there in 1298.

After the death of the emperor Michael, and the reinstatement of the old patriarch Joseph, the party of the Arsenians, which had ever continued to propagate itself in secret, once more emerged from obscurity. They were as zealous against Joseph as the other party were against Beccus; and the same fanaticism as the followers of the patriarch Joseph had shown in avoiding all intercourse with the unionists, the Arsenians manifested in refusing fellowship with the so-called Josephites. They wanted to have a church by themselves at Constantinople. No one was pure enough for them, because they looked upon all as polluted by the worship performed by the Josephites. At length a magnificent church, that of All-saints, occurred to them, which for a long time had been shut up and not used, and which therefore they might suppose themselves entitled to regard as perfectly pure,— and from the peace-loving emperor, who hoped to win this important party by mildness, they managed to obtain this church for their assemblies. The greater the concessions made to them, the higher rose their demands and their wishes. Toleration did not satisfy them; they wanted to be masters. They were convinced that the justice of their cause would be made manifest by a judgment of God, a miracle. They even succeeded in prevailing on the emperor to enter into their foolish proposals. He was concerned for nothing but the peace of the church, which was also a matter of political importance. This, deceiving himself, he hoped he should be able to secure, at all events, whether God by a miracle decided in favor of the Arsenians,— in which case the party of the Josephites would be compelled to acknowledge their rights, — or the miracle did not take place, when the Arsenians, undeceived, would be obliged to yield. He ordered, therefore, that the bones of John of Damascus should be given them for this purpose; that a writing in attestation of their cause should be laid on these bones, and

[1] Pachymeres, lib. i, p. 34.

that by the mediation of the saint a miracle might be wrought for their party. Already the Arsenians proceeded to prepare themselves by fasting, prayer, and vigils for this judgment of God; when the emperor, whether of his own impulse, or by the influence of others, was induced to alter his determination. Perhaps he feared the political consequences; for easily might political movements attach themselves to the tendency of the Arsenian faction; as the victory of the cause of Arsenius might be regarded as a decision against the legality of the reign of Michael Paleologus, and consequently of his successor. He directed that the trial should be forbidden, and that the Arsenians should be told that men ought not to wish to have things decided according to their own notions, but should follow the ways of divine wisdom, as they were made known in the government of the world. Now it was obvious that no miracle had been wrought for a long period of time. They had ceased, ever since Christianity began to be more widely spread. The writings of the fathers were sufficient to furnish the knowledge of God's will, — even as Christ himself assured the rich man, who required the resurrection of one from the dead, that Moses and the prophets were sufficient.

In vain did the emperor hope that after the death of the patriarch Joseph, in 1283, to whom the Arsenians were so hostile, both parties might be reconciled by means of the new patriarch Georgius: the Arsenians would only follow the decision by a judgment of God. As God is the same now as in ancient times, said they, so will he also ever manifest himself by miracles, provided only we doubt not.[1] And the emperor finally yielded to them in order to secure the wished-for peace. A great fire was to be kindled, and a writing composed according to their principles, by each of the parties, was to be cast into it. The party whose writing remained uninjured should be held to be right; and even should both writings be consumed, this should be regarded as a token whereby God signified his will that they should conclude a peace with each other. The emperor directed that a large vase of silver should be manufactured for the purpose. The great Sabbath before Easter, a day held especially sacred, was chosen for the holding of this judgment of God. Before a numerous and gorgeous assembly, at the head of which stood the emperor himself, the fire was lighted, the two documents were thrown into it, and, as was to be expected, both were soon burnt to ashes.[2] Now, even the Arsenians declared themselves ready to acknowledge the patriarch, and to unite again with the rest of the church. The emperor, who thought he had accomplished a great thing, led them full of joy, late in the evening, in rough weather, amid ice and snow, to the patriarch, who gave them his blessing. Yet the joy soon proved to be idle. This was only an effect of the first transient impression of events; on the next morning all had become cool again. Thus every attempt at union proved abortive, and the more so in proportion to the pains taken to bring the thing about by outward measures.

[1] Pachymeres, lib. i, p. 60. [2] Pachymeres says: τὸ πῦρ οὐκ ᾐνόει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν,

III. Sects which stood forth in Opposition to the Hierarchy.

We have seen, in the preceding periods, how the reactions of the sects which had sprung up from the intermingling of oriental theosophy with Christianity, still continued to propagate themselves amid all the persecutions in the Greek church, and to emerge again from obscurity under continually new forms. The inward corruption of the Greek church, and the unsatisfied religious need of the laity, furnished a good occasion for these reactions. The political and ecclesiastical despotism which sought to suppress, served rather to promote them. If mysticism sprung up here and there, within the retreats of the monastic life, it might, by its very opposition to this prevailing worldliness, be the more easily led into an anti-churchlike direction, or to blend itself with other mystical directions, already possessed of an heretical coloring. The Paulicians had now established themselves in fixed settlements, beyond the limits of the Greek empire, and might spread back again to the spots whence they came; as we know they had a great zeal for making proselytes. Their bravery procured them admittance among the hireling troops of the hard-pressed Greek empire, and here they enjoyed a new opportunity for diffusing abroad their doctrines. In the preceding periods, we saw the sect of the Euchites, who were essentially distinguished by a peculiar modification of Dualism from the Paulicians, making their appearance under a monk-like shape, and we observed their efforts to get introduced among the Slavic population.[1] From this centre, they now spread back again into the Greek empire; for the sect of the Bogomiles, concerning whom we are now to speak, betray, beyond the possibility of a doubt, by an affinity of doctrines, their origin from that quarter; and the express testimonies of contemporary writers with regard to their Bulgarian extraction, as well as their manifestly Slavic name, confirms the same thing; whether that name was, according to the interpretation of the Greeks, derived from the circumstance that, in their prayers, they were heard frequently calling on God for mercy,[2] or whether the Slavic signification of the word Bogumil, one beloved of God,[3] is the fundamental one, so that this name, denoting a pious community, may be considered analogous to the "Friends of God," in Germany. What is said by themselves goes to show that they sprung up out of the midst of ecclesiastics or monks of the Greek church.

[1] See vol. iii, p. 591.

[2] "Bog milui," Lord, have mercy. See the 23d chapter of the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus, published by Dr. Gieseler, 1842, in the Greek original: Βούλγαρων γλῶσσα καλεῖ τὸν θεὸν, μίλουι δὲ τὸ ἐλεησον. εἰη δ' ἂν Βογόμιλος κατ' αὐτοὺς ὁ του θεοῦ τὸν ἔλεον ἐπισπώμενος. Thus this name would be analogous to that of the Euchites, Messalians.

[3] See the remarks of Gieseler on the above-cited words of Euthymius. Euthymius cites, from the Bogomiles: παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γραμματέων καὶ διδασκάλων μαθεῖν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ γεννᾶται (their communities) ἀφ' ἡμῶν γὰρ γενέσθαι τοὺς πρώτους διδασκάλους αὐτῶν. Comp. what is said of the Euchites, vol. iii, p. 591. Yet in the passages there cited, from the dialogue of Michael Psellus, περὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων, p. 2, ed. Boissonade, 1838, by the ἱερὸν κόμμα is to be understood, not the Catholic clerus, but the Catholic church generally, as opposed to the πονηρὸν κόμμα of the heretics.

The Bogomiles, like the Euchites of the eleventh century, have nothing in common with the older Gnostics. We hear not a word from them concerning a doctrine of Aeons, or concerning an original evil principle. But they busied themselves with a higher doctrine of spirits. The name Satanael,[1] and the figure of God as the ancient of days,[2] might seem to point to Jewish elements, which had exercised an influence on the authors of the sect. Perhaps on this point, also, the language of the Bogomiles themselves should be taken into consideration, who, in allegorically expounding the account of the star of the wise men, called Jerusalem the Catholic church, the star the Mosaic law, which had first guided them to the Catholic church, where they learned from the priests and lawyers that Christ was born in Bethlehem, that is, that the true Christ was to be found in that community which, by a reaction of reform, had itself gone forth from the Catholic church.[3] Satanael, they regarded as the first-born son of the supreme God, — in which they agreed with the Euchites, and with one particular view of the Parsic dualism,[4] — who sat at the right hand of God, armed with divine power, and holding the second place after him. To each of the higher spirits, God had committed a particular department of administration, while Satanael was placed over all, as his universal vicegerent. Thus he was tempted to become proud; and, intoxicated with the sense of his power and dignity, was for making himself independent of the supreme God, and founding an empire of his own. He endeavored, also, to lead away from their allegiance the angels to whom God had entrusted the management of the different portions of the world; and he succeeded with a part of them. The Bogomiles believed they found Satanael described in the unjust steward of the parable, and they expended much labor in expounding the several points in the parable in accordance with this notion.[5] Satanael now called together the angels who had apostatized with him,[6] and invited them to join him in laying the groundwork of a new creation, independent of the supreme God, a new heaven and a new earth; for the Father had not yet deprived him of his divine form, he had not as yet lost the El, but still possessed creative power. He let himself down, therefore, with his apostate companions, into chaos, and here laid the foundations of this new em-

[1] Like Sammael, among the Jews.

[2] The words of Euthymius: *Λέγουσιν, οὐκ ὄναρ μόνον πολλάκις ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕπαρ βλέπειν τὸν πατέρα ὡς γέροντα βαθυγένειον*, ed. Gieseler, p. 33. How they represented God, also, under a human shape: *ἀνθρωποπρόσωπον ὑπολαμβάνουσι*, p. 7.

[3] See the excerpt, from Euthymius, published by Gieseler, p. 35.

[4] See my Church History, vol. i, sect. 2, p. 489.

[5] These doctrines are all found again in the conversation betwixt Christ and the apostle John, published under the name of this apostle, which apocryphal writing was published from the Archives of the Inquisitorial tribunal at Carcassone, by the Dominican Jean Benoist, in his Histoire des Albigeois, t. i, and last by Thilo, in the first volume of his Cod. apocryph. Novi Testamenti, p. 885. The same doctrine concerning the apostasy of Satanael occasioned by pride, concerning the arts which he employed to seduce the angels, placed as vicegerents over the different parts of the world, as well as the comparison between Satanael and the unjust steward, is there carried out in all its particulars, — a certain proof that the above document is to be traced, directly or indirectly, to the Bogomiles. In fact, this apocryphal writing is said to have been brought, by an heretical bishop, from Bulgaria to France.

[6] According to the above-mentioned Pseudo-Johannean gospel, it was a third part of the angels.

pire; with his angels he created man, and gave him a body formed out of the earth.[1] To animate this being, he meant to give him a portion of his own spirit; but he was unable to carry the work to its completion. Therefore he had recourse to the supreme God, beseeching him to have pity on his own image, and binding himself to share with him in the possession of man. He promised that, by the race proceeding from man, the places of those angels should be made good who had fallen from God in heaven.[2] So the supreme God took pity on this image, and communicated to it a portion of his own spirit, and so man became a living soul. But now, when Adam and Eve, who had been created with him, became radiant with splendor, in virtue of the divine life that had been communicated to them, Satanael, seized with envy, resolved to defeat the destination of mankind to enter into those vacant places of the higher spiritual world. For this purpose he seduced Eve, intending by intercourse with her to bring forth a posterity which should overpower and extinguish the posterity of Adam. Thus Cain was begotten, the representative of the evil principle in humanity; while Abel, the offspring of Adam and Eve, was the representative of the good principle. Satanael ruled in the world he had created. He had power to lead astray the majority of mankind, so that but few attained to their ultimate destination. It was he who represented himself to the Jews as the supreme God. He employed Moses as his instrument; giving him the law, which in fact the apostle Paul describes as begetting sin; he bestowed on Moses the power of working miracles. Many thousands were thus brought to ruin by the tyranny of Satanael. Then the good God had pity on the higher nature in humanity which had proceeded from himself and was akin to his own, in that humanity which had become so estranged from its destination by the crafty plots of Satanael. He determined to rescue men from the dominion of Satanael, and to deprive the latter of his power. For this purpose, in the 5500th year after the creation of the world, he caused to emanate from himself a spirit who was called the Son of God, Logos, the archangel Michael, exalted above all the angels, the angel of the great council, Isa. 9: 6, who was to overthrow the empire of Satanael and occupy his place. This being he sent down into the world in an ethereal body, which resembled an earthly body only in its outward appearance. He made use of Mary simply as a channel of introduction. She found the divine child already in its swaddling-clothes in the manger, without knowing how it came there. Of course, all that was sensible here, was merely in appearance. Satanael, who held Jesus to be nothing more than a man, and saw his kingdom among the Jews drawn into apostasy and endangered by him, plotted his death. But Jesus baffled him; in reality, he could not be affected by any sensuous sufferings. He who, though supposed to be dead, was exalted

[1] In the account of the creation of man (anthropogony), the above-mentioned apocryphal gospel differed entirely from the doctrine of the Bogomiles, as the latter is represented by Euthymius.

[2] We recognize, here, something common to the Bogomiles with the church theology; for it was a very commonly-spread doctrine, that the elect among men were to take the place of the fallen angels.

above all suffering, appeared on the third day, in the full vigor of life, when, laying aside the veil of his seeming earthly body, he showed himself to Satanael in his true heavenly form. The latter was forced to acknowledge his supremacy, and being deprived by Christ of his divine power, was obliged to give up the name El, and remain nothing but Satan.[1] Christ then ascended to the right hand of God, to be the second after him, and to occupy the place of the ruined Satanael.[2] When Christ was now removed from the earth, and taken up into heaven, God caused a second power, the Holy Ghost, to emanate from himself, who took the place of the now risen and exalted Christ, by his influences on individual souls and the community of the faithful.[3] It may be noticed as a characteristic peculiarity, that the Holy Spirit was represented by the Bogomiles under the form of a beardless youth, doubtless a symbol of his all-renovating power. They regarded it as the final end of all things, that when Christ and the Holy Ghost should have finished their whole work, all the consequences of the apostasy from God would be removed, and the redeemed souls would attain to their final destination. Then God would receive back into himself those powers which had emanated from him, and all things would return to their original unity.[4] Accordingly,

[1] It is manifest from a comparison of Euthymius with himself, that he has represented the matter erroneously, when he says, earlier (p. 13, l. c.), the good God deprived Satanael of the El, in punishment for his cohabiting with Eve. What he himself says (p. 17) contradicts this, and is, without doubt, the correct statement, namely, that this was first brought about by Christ. So the accounts given by Euthymius generally, may not always be quite accurate. So it may not be an altogether faithful representation of the Bogomilian doctrine, when Euthymius (p. 17) says that, according to the same, Satanael is not only deprived, by Christ, of his El, but also thrust down to hell; for this contradicts what Euthymius himself observes (p. 27), where he says the Bogomiles taught that, as Satanael once had the temple of Jerusalem for his seat, so, after its destruction, he chose for this same purpose the temple of St. Sophia, in Constantinople. But if so, then though Satan was no longer Satanael, yet he still continued to exercise a certain power over the unredeemed. Euthymius perhaps failed here, as in other cases, to separate things which were altogether distinct in the doctrine of the Bogomiles.

[2] Euthymius doubtless falls into the mistake, again, of not sufficiently separating things which were distinct, when he attributes to the Bogomiles the doctrine that Christ, after his ascension to heaven, relinquished his independent existence, and again sunk back into the one essence of the Father. *Εἶτα εἰσελθεῖν, ὅθεν ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ἀναλυθῆναι πάλιν εἰς τὸν πατέρα.* p. 17. In fact, the two assertions contradict each other, that Christ, at his exaltation to the right hand of God, assumed a rank next to the Father, and at the same time sunk back into the essence of God, from which he had emanated. One of these statements evidently excludes the other. The only way to clear up the contradiction, is to suppose that what is here represented as taking place at the same moment, is really distributed into different moments, the sitting at the right hand of God taking place directly after Christ's resurrection and ascension to heaven, while his return into the essence of God was not to take place till after the completion of the whole work of redemption, and the total destruction of Satanael's kingdom.

[3] Euthymius may possibly be under a mistake from the same cause, namely, from failing to distinguish different moments, when he represents it as the doctrine of the Bogomiles, that the Son of God and the Holy Spirit had both emanated from God at the same time. Vide § 3. That God *τριπρόσωπος ἀπο τοῦ πεντακις χιλιοστου πεντακοσιόστου ἔτους*, namely, since the birth of Christ; see § 23. *τὸν πατέρα μὲν ὡς γέροντα βαθυγένειον, τὸν δὲ υἱὸν ὡς ὑπηνήτην ἄνδρα, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὡς λειοπρόσωπον νεανίαν.*

[4] *Τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς τὸν πατέρα πάλιν, ὡς οὐ προῆλθον, ἀναλυθῆναι καὶ τριπρόσωπον αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πεντακις χιλιοστοῦ ἔτους ἀχρι καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τριῶν ἐτῶν χρηματίσαντα πάλιν γενεσθαι μονοπρόσωπον.* Here, again, it is easy to see that Euthymius has confounded things different in kind; for it cannot be a correct representation of the Bogomilian doctrine

the Bogomilian view of the Trinity is most nearly akin to the Sabellian; and from this point of view they might say, conforming to the faith of the church, that they believed in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[1]

They rejected the church baptism, as a mere baptism with water, following here the anti-judaizing Gnostics; and as the apocryphal gospel of John faithfully represents on this point the doctrine of the Bogomiles, there can be no doubt that they looked upon John the Baptist as a servant of the Jewish God Satanael, and the water-baptism therefore which proceeded from him as opposed to Christian baptism. The only Christian baptism was a baptism of the Spirit, to be imparted simply by calling upon the Holy Ghost, with the laying on of hands. There were two modes of initiation into their sect; after the individual who wished to be received into their community had first prepared himself for it by the confession of sins, fasting, and prayer, he was introduced into their assembly, when the presiding officer laid the gospel of John on his head, and they invoked upon him the Holy Ghost, and repeated the Lord's prayer. A season of probation was then assigned to him, during which he must lead a life of the strictest abstinence. If men and women bore testimony that he had faithfully observed this season of probation, he was once more introduced into their assembly, placed with his face towards the east, and the gospel of John again laid on his head. The men and women of the assembly again touched his head with their hands, and sung together a hymn of thanksgiving that he had proved himself worthy to become a member of their community.

As they rejected outward baptism, so they seem also to have rejected altogether the outward celebration of the Lord's supper;[2] probably understanding the Lord's supper spiritually and symbolically of the communion with Christ, as the bread of life that came down from heaven; to which also they applied the petition for our daily bread in the Lord's prayer, as signifying a participation in the new fellowship of life, founded by Christ; and by this petition the original unity of the spiritual world — in virtue of which all called upon God as their common Father, but which had been broken up by Satanael — was restored. The Lord's prayer was the symbol of this unity restored.[3]

with regard to Christ to say that, after finishing his work on earth, he sunk back into the divine essence; still less can it be so with regard to the Holy Spirit, whose agency was to begin at the very point of time when Christ ascended to heaven. We are perfectly warranted, therefore, to represent the theory otherwise, so as to make it consistent with itself.

[1] Euthym. § 2: Τὰς τρεῖς ταύτας κλήσεις τῷ πατρὶ προσάπτουσι καὶ ἀνθρωποπρόσωπον τοῦτων ὑπολαμβάνουσι, παρ' ἑκατέραν μηνίγγα ἀκτῖνα ἐκλάμποντα, τὴν μὲν υἱοῦ, τὴν δὲ πνεύματος.

[2] If we find among those Catharists, who in various respects were related to the Bogomiles in their doctrines, something like an outward celebration of the Lord's supper, yet we cannot with safety argue back from this circumstance to the tenets held by the latter, for there were still many points in which the two sects differed from each other.

[3] We must endeavor, as far as the case admits of it, to make out the real opinion of the Bogomiles, from the obscure account by Euthymius, compared with a passage in the apocryphal gospel of John. Euthymius's words are: Ἄρτον τῆς κοινωνίας ὀνομάζουσι τὴν προσευχὴν τοῦ πατὲρ ἡμῶν, τὸν ἄρτον γὰρ φησὶ τὸν ἐπιούσιον, ποτήριον δὲ κοινωνίας ὁμοίως τὴν λεγομένην ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διαθήκην, τοῦτο γὰρ φησι τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη· μυστικὸν δὲ

We should notice in this connection, that the Bogomiles, consistently with their Docetism, could recognize no other than a spiritual communion with Christ. The sacrifice of the mass, according to the dominant church, they interpreted as an offering to evil spirits residing within the church.

From what has been said, it is manifest into what opposition with the dominant church the Bogomiles would be driven by their mystical element. They contended against the worship of the Virgin Mary, of the saints, and of images. The true *θεοτόκος*, said they, is the soul of the real believer, of the Bogomile, which carries the Logos in itself; and while it leads others to the divine life, produces that life out of itself. In the Iconoclasts, they recognized kindred spirits. It was only the patriarchs and emperors of this party whom they regarded as Christians. The image worshippers, on the other hand, they called idolaters. They honored especially Constantine Copronymus, a fact easily explained from popular rumors[1] concerning him. But this circumstance affords grounds for important conclusions with regard to the origin of this sect. We find evidence here, that this sect had sprung up neither in a foreign country, nor at this particular point of time; else, how could they have known so much about this emperor, or how should they concern themselves about him one way or the other?

When, however, the representatives of the Catholic church appealed to miracles wrought by the relics of saints, it never occurred to the uncritical minds of the Bogomiles to call these miracles in question. They resorted to another mode of confutation. As it was their doctrine that every man is attended by a good or evil spirit; they said, the evil spirits connected with those advocates of error in their lifetime, wrought these miracles after their death, with a view to seduce the simple and lead them to worship the unholy as holy. Nor could they tolerate that reverence for the cross which was permitted even by Iconoclasts. This we might infer, indeed, from their view of Christ's passion. And when men told them of the power of the cross over the demoniacal world, they either replied that evil spirits hailed the symbol with joy, as typifying the instrument which they would have employed for the death of the Redeemer, or that they only practised dissimulation in order to lead men into error. The churches they scorned, as seats of evil spirits; for the Most High, who has heaven for his habitation, dwells not in temples made with hands. According to their own principles, they might, for the purpose of escaping persecution, pretend

δεῖπνον τὴν ἀμφοτέρων τούτων μετάληψιν. He says himself, that Bogomiles, when asked in what sense they understood these words, replied that they did not know themselves; whether it was that the individuals of whom he inquired belonged to the more ignorant class, or that they did not wish to disclose the esoteric sense of the doctrine. From the apocryphal gospel, the words of Christ belong here: Quia ego sum panis vitae descendens de septimo coelo et qui manducant carnem meam et bibunt sanguinem meum, isti filii Dei vocabuntur. And to the question, what it meant to eat his flesh and drink his blood, Christ answers: Ante ruinam diaboli cum omni militia sua a gloria patris in oratione orando sic glorificabant patrem in orationibus dicendo: pater noster, qui es in coelis, et ita omnia cantica eorum ascendebant ante sedem patris. Et cum cecidissent, postea non possunt glorificare Deum in oratione ista.

[1] See vol. iii, p. 222.

to join in the church worship. They looked upon it all as the work of evil spirits; and then they supposed a certain dominion over the world was allowed by the Father to Satanael, until the termination of the seventh aeon (the seven thousandth year). The Bogomiles, like one class of the Euchites, noticed by us in the preceding periods, believed they ought occasionally to enter into some agreement with Satanael and his powers so long as his empire still subsisted. They appealed, in proof of this, to the words ascribed to Christ in one of their apocryphal gospels: "Reverence not the evil spirits for the purpose of obtaining anything from them, but that they may not injure you."[1] "Therefore," said they, "we are bound to reverence the evil spirits dwelling in the temples, lest they be wroth against those who omit to do so, and involve them in ruin (namely, by stirring up persecutions against them)."[2] They cited also another apocryphal saying of Christ: "Save yourselves with craft,"[3] the maxim by which they sought to justify the various arts of dissimulation resorted to by them for the salvation of their lives. The words of Christ, in Matt. 23: 3, they explained as follows: "We should affect to do everything which the hierarchy prescribes; but not really follow their works." The fact also that Christ spoke to the multitude in parables, was one to which they gave their own peculiar interpretation.

Since the Bogomiles regarded the body as a prison-house, wherein the soul, which is related to God, has been confined, death appeared to them the means of release for such faithful ones as had become partakers of the divine life here below. "These," said they, "do not die, but they are transported over, as it were, in a sleep, putting off this earthly coil of the flesh without pain, and putting on the imperishable and divine clothing of Christ."[4]

As it regards the canon of the Bogomiles, Euthymius reports that they rejected the historical books of the Old Testament, and received the Psalms and prophets, and all the writings of the New Testament. But whether he has correctly represented their opinion on this point may well be doubted. Certainly they did not attribute to the other books the same authority as to the gospel of John, which in fact always appears as the principal book with them. Very probably they might, in conversation with the friends of the church, to whose views they wished to accommodate themselves, have appealed to these Scriptures, where they thought they could interpret them in favor of their own doctrines, without allowing them on that account the authority of a rule of faith. It may be too that, like the Manicheans, they distinguished in these Scriptures parts that were true, from others which they considered false. It is plain, that they could not, according to

[1] Τμᾶτε τὰ δαιμόνια, οὐχ' ἵνα ὠφελήθητε παρ' αὐτῶν. ἀλλ' ἵνά μὴ βλαψωσιν ὑμᾶς.

[2] The relationship of the Euchites and Bogomiles with the so-called Syrian devil-worshippers, Jezidaners, can hardly be mistaken; whether it was that the latter sprung from the former, or that both had a common origin.

[3] Τρόπῳ σωθῆτε.

[4] Τοὺς τοιούτους μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ μεθίστασθαι, καθάπερ ἐν ὕπνῳ, τὸ πήλινον τουτὶ καὶ σαρκινὸν περιβόλαιον ἀπόνως ἐκδυομένους καὶ τὴν ἀφθαρτον καὶ θείαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ στολὴν ἐνδυομένους.

their doctrine, receive the whole, unless they allowed themselves in the most forced interpretations. It would be even so with the gospel of John, which so directly contradicts their representation of John the Baptist; and it may justly be questioned, whether their gospel was really the genuine gospel of John. The history of Christ's infancy they explained as a symbolical clothing of higher facts, or as a myth. They asserted also, that the gospels had been falsified by the church teaching; and they named Chrysostom[1] in particular, as one of these falsifiers. Owing to their theosophic bent, they were set against all scientific culture. The grammarians, with whom they would have nothing to do, were to them the same as the scribes of the New Testament, whom they put in one class with the Pharisees.

While the Bogomiles looked upon the dominant church as a church apostate from Christ, and ruled by Satanael, they represented themselves as the true Christians, citizens of Christ.[2]

As they supposed they might resort to every species of accommodation and dissimulation, as they generally succeeded by their rigid and monk-like life in commanding a certain degree of respect, and before they began to divulge their peculiar doctrine cited from the Bible a great deal that was applicable to Christian life and opposed to the doctrines of the church, they found no difficulty in getting hearers among the laity and clergy in Constantinople, and in the towns and villages of the country.[3] Adherents of this sect were to be found in the greatest families connected with the court.[4] The emperor, Alexius Comnenus, on hearing of this, resolved to spare no pains in ferreting out the doctrines which were held so secretly, and in bringing their heads and teachers to punishment. Information having been obtained, by torture, from certain members of the sect who had been arrested, that an old man, known as a monk, and named Basilius, stood at their head, the emperor caused him to be brought, in a covert manner — as it was pretended — to the palace, where he treated him with great honor, invited him to sit at his own table, and professed a wish to be instructed in their doctrines, with a view of joining the sect. Basilius, though at first mistrustful, at length fell into the trap, and set forth all the doctrines of the sect to the emperor, his imagined disciple. But behind a curtain sat one charged with the business of taking down minutes of the whole conversation. When the thing had been carried far enough, the curtain was raised, and, to his consternation, Basilius saw the notables of the spiritual and secular orders, the former, under

[1] Vide § 21.

[2] *Χριστιανοί, χριστοπολῖται.* See the little tract of Euthymius against the Bogomiles, published in J. Tollii Itinerar. Italic. p. 112: *χριστιανοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ὀνομάζοντες οἱ μισόχριστοι* and *χριστοπολίτας*, p. 122.

[3] In Anathem. xii, (J. Tollii insignia Itinerar. Ita...), it is said, that those who joined the Bogomiles from the lay order, did not hesitate to partake of the church communion, and that the priests, who had secretly joined this sect, continued to celebrate mass as before, p. 122. Euthymius says, in the tract on the sect of the Bogomiles, published by J. Tolle, p. 112: *Ἐν πάσῃ πόλει καὶ χώρᾳ καὶ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπιπολάζει τὰ νῦν.*

[4] *Ἐνεδύθυνε τὸ κακὸν καὶ εἰς οἰκίας μεγίστας καὶ πολλοῦ πλήθους ἥψατο τὸ δεινόν.* Anna Comnena Alexias, lib. xv f. 387, Ed. Venet.

the presidency of the patriarch Nicholas, assembled before him. The copy of what he had said to the emperor was shown him, and he confessed that these were his doctrines, and declared himself ready to suffer the loss of all things for them. Upon this, he was led away to prison, and many of all ranks were arrested as Bogomiles. Of these, some confessed that they had joined the sect; others denied it. To separate the innocent from the guilty the emperor resorted to a trick, in which very probably he may have been outwitted by many of his victims. He directed that all who had been arrested should appear on a public place, before a grand and numerous assembly, in the centre of which sat the emperor himself, elevated on a throne. Two great fires were kindled; by one of these was erected a cross, by the other none. The emperor now declared that, as he was unable to distinguish the innocent from the guilty, he would cause them all to be put to death. Those who wished to die as believers should pass to the fire with the cross, and pay their homage to the latter. A division having thus been made among the condemned, the emperor directed both parties to be conducted back to their places. Those, whom by this test he supposed he had ascertained to be orthodox, he dismissed with a few words of admonition. The others he sent back to their prison. The emperor and the patriarch expended a great deal of labor in gradually instructing these latter, which, however, did not succeed except with a few, who were therefore pardoned. The rest were condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Basilius alone, who would listen to no persuasions, being the leader of the sect, was condemned to die at the stake (A. D. 1119). It is said that he proceeded to the place of his execution at first in a triumphant confidence of faith, singing the thirtieth Psalm.[1] But when he came nearer, and beheld the curling volume of flames, he could no longer suppress the feelings of nature. Clasping together his hands, he held them before his face; but in the end he held fast to his confession.

The Bogomiles were already too widely spread in the Greek empire, to be rooted out by such measures as these. Among laymen, ecclesiastics, and monks, many might continue to go on and propagate themselves in secret. The writings of a venerated monk, Constantinos Chrysomalos, are said to have contributed greatly to the diffusion of these doctrines. But it was not till after his death, that attention was directed to the threatening danger from this quarter; and a synod assembled under the emperor Manuel Comnenus, in 1140, at Constantinople, pronounced sentence of condemnation on him and his followers. Yet it may be questioned, whether the name Bogomiles was not here employed for the purpose of stigmatizing as heretics those who had no connection with them, but attacked from some other point of view the prevailing worldliness of the dominant church; persons who had nothing in common with the Bogomiles, except a certain

[1] It may be doubted whether his words, and the lively hope therein expressed, have not been understood too grossly, when he is represented as expecting that the flames would not hurt him, but angels would snatch him from the midst of them.

fervent mystical tendency, which was not to be satisfied by the common church theology. Perhaps a certain connection may have subsisted between this mystical tendency and the Bogomiles; yet we have no good reason for supposing that this tendency itself had sprung out of Bogomilian principles.

It is manifest from what has been communicated to us from the writings of this monk, that there existed a secret society, which was supposed to have the power of imparting a higher spiritual life than could be attained by the sacraments of the church, and in connection with which there were many rites and ceremonies of initiation. The transformation of man by a new divine life, making him capable of the intuition of divine things, was set over against a dead Scripture learning, and the mechanical forms of the church; an antagonism constantly occurring under various forms, in the mystical theology of all ages. We find great use made here of the ideas of St. Paul, a circumstance not wont to distinguish the mysticism of the Greek church, which possessed less affinity with the Pauline spirit; neither do any indications of it appear among the Bogomiles. Since the subjective element, the progressive development of a divine life beginning with a change of nature (*ἀναστοιχείωσις*), was considered the main thing, without which no man could be in the true sense a Christian, this led to the rejection of infant baptism. "Those who had been baptized in childhood, without previous instruction, were not Christians, it was said, though they were called so. Though they might live in the practice of many virtues, yet these were nothing better than single good actions among the heathen." It was understood by this party that the characteristic thing in the condition of a Christian, did not consist in insulated virtues, but in the main direction and bent of the whole life. "All singing and praying, all participation in the outward rites of the church, all study of the Scriptures, is dead and nugatory, separate from this inward change, whereby man is delivered from the power of the evil principle. Though one should know every word of Scripture by heart, and in the pride of that knowledge which puffeth up, pretend to teach others, still, it profits nothing, unless accompanied with this higher instruction in spiritual things; this transformation, this new shaping of the condition of the soul.[1]

In his polemical attacks on holiness by works, Chrysomalos follows the apostle Paul. "To the obtaining of that grace of inward transformation," says he, "man's own doings can contribute nothing: it is obtained by faith alone. It is by this alone that a man becomes capable of any real virtue. Though such as have not attained to that higher position may insist upon it, that they bring forth good actions for God's sake, still, they really act from a sort of instinct rather than from rational consciousness."[2] We here meet with the doctrine which often occurs among the mystics, that all purely human agency must

[1] Εἰ μὴ κατηχηθέντες αὐθις ἀναστοιχειώσεως (or μεταστοιχειώσεως) τύχωσι καὶ μορφώσεως τῶν ψυχικῶν αὐτῶν ἕξεων.

[2] Δαίμοσι γὰρ ἐοικέναι τοὺς ταῦτα κατορθοῦντας καὶ ὁμολογοῦντας μὲν διὰ τὸν θεὸν κατορθοῦν, ἀλόγως δὲ ταῦτα ποιοῦντας.

sink to nothing, and God alone produce the entire work in the soul which he fills. Hence, all which the man does himself appears tainted with sin. . " It profits Christians nothing to live in the practice of all the virtues, and to shun all the vices, though they do it for God's sake, if they have not obtained a spiritual feeling of the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, producing within them by nature and without constraint that which is good, and making them quite invincible to the temptations of evil.[1] He who is not conscious that God himself accomplishes his own will in him through Christ, labors in vain.[2] Those true Christians who have arrived at the maturity of Christian manhood stand no longer under the law. By virtue of God's agency within them, they fulfil the law to the utmost."

Contempt for all civil authority was one charge brought against the followers of this doctrine. But a seditious turn could hardly be united with a mysticism of this sort. The charge probably grew out of the spiritual self-conceit with which they affected to look down upon all the high dignities in the secular and ecclesiastical orders as belonging to a much lower sphere of spiritual understanding than their own. Perhaps they only inveighed against those extravagant titles which, after the oriental fashion, were in those times bestowed on the great, and declared them to be idolatrous and unworthy of Christians. So at least we might gather from many of their expressions.[3]

They are said to have maintained, that no man is a Christian who is not conscious of having within him two souls, one subject to sin, and one superior to all evil, sinless.[4] If this is a correct representation of their doctrine, it must be understood in the sense that, first, by the new birth, man has a soul without sin; and, by means of it, is in a condition to resist the soul burdened with sin. We can hardly suppose, however, that on the basis of this mysticism, such an antagonism between the godlike and ungodlike principles would be considered as having been first called forth by Christianity. More probably, the doctrine, in this particular aspect of it, has not been correctly represented; and perhaps the opinion was this, that, from the very first, there are in every man two souls; a higher nature, which St. Paul designates as the inner man, — a nature superior to all contact with sin, but which through the predominance of the ungodly principle is prevented from passing into action: this is first made active by becoming united with its original source through the redemption, is thus freed from the yoke of the foreign nature; and so the man attains to freedom from sin. With the laying on of hands, unction, and various mystic rites, the consecration was consummated by the spiritual superiors of the society on those who longed after this *ἀναστοιχείωσις*.[5]

[1] Εἰ *μὴ νοερὰν αἴσθησιν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος δέξονται, ὑσικῶς τε καὶ ἀνωδύνως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐνεργοῦντος τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἀκινήτους πάντη ποιοῦντος πρὸς τὸ κακόν.*

[2] *Ὅστις οὐ νοερᾷ αἰσθήσει νοερῶς αἰσθάνεται ποιοῦντος ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς κενὸν κοπιᾷ.*

[3] *Ὅσα πρὸς ἀτιμίαν ἀρχῆς ἀπάσης καὶ περὶ φρύνησιν (ἐγράφησαν) τῷ Σατανᾷ προσκυνεῖν ἀποφλαυρήσαντι τοὺς ὁποιῳδὴ ποτε ἄρχοντι τιμὴν ἢ προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμοντας.*

[4] *Ὡς πᾶς χριστιανὸς δύο ἔχει ψυχὰς, τὴν μὲν αὐτῶν ἀναμάρτητον, τὴν δὲ ἁμαρτητικήν.*

[5] As it is called, *διὰ τῆς τελεσιουργήσεως.*

That reaction against the corrupt church proceeding from a spirit of reform, which it was ever found impossible to suppress, was doubtless propagated in a secret manner; and in the beginning of the reign of the emperor Emmanuel Comnenus, a certain monk appears at Constantinople, by the name of Niphon, who stood at the head of this more widely spread movement. By his pious and strict life he had won universal reverence. He is described as being a man unversed in the ancient literature, but so much the more familiar with the Holy Scriptures.[1] That one who was governed by a predominant practical and biblical tendency, who from his childhood had occupied himself chiefly with the study of the Bible, should allow himself to be carried away by the doctrines of the Bogomiles, is in itself hardly probable, but it is more easy to conceive that such an one might be impelled by his opposition to a dead and formal orthodoxy, and the hierarchy connected therewith, to a mystical theology. We must also admit it to be possible, that a school for the propagation of Bogomilian ideas, had formed itself among the monks, and that Niphon may from the first have been educated in this school. This Niphon seems to have exercised an extensive influence. He maintained a close correspondence, particularly with the bishops of Cappadocia, and there was a peculiar spirit which seems to have animated these bishops. Some clue to the matter was got hold of, and, under the presidency of the patriarch Michael of Constantinople, several *endemic synods* were held there in opposition to these tendencies.[2] Men were disposed to trace in them the diffusion of Bogomilian principles; but the only thing that could point to such principles is what was said of this party, that they did not regard the God of the Old Testament as the true God.[3] But considering the slight respect which was paid to truth among the Greeks of this period, we may doubt whether such a declaration is altogether worthy of credit; and even if it were, such a doctrine may just as well be traced to other sources as to the sect of the Bogomiles. When those bishops were accused of rebaptizing such as had received infant baptism, on the ground that they regarded this transaction as invalid, having been performed by vicious men; this certainly is inconsistent with the principles of the Bogomiles, who allowed no validity to water-baptism in any way. Various other circumstances indicate a tendency which was seeking to restore primitive Christianity, striving to oppose superstition. Without needing to resort to the hypothesis of any Bogomilian element, we may on *this ground* alone

καὶ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως τῶν ἐπιστημόνων οἰκονόμων τῆς μυστικῆς ταύτης χάριτος — διὰ τῆς εἰσαγομένης κατηχήσεως τε καὶ μυήσεως μίρων τε χρίσεως ἀναστοιχειωθέντες. The presidents ἐπισκενάσται. See the excerpts from the acts of that Synod, in Leonis Allatii de ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione. Colon. 1648. Lib. ii, c. xi, p. 646.

[1] The historian of this time, John Cinnamos, says of him: παιδείας μὲν τῆς ἐγκυκλίου καὶ μαθημάτων οὐδὲ μέχρι πείρας ἐλθών, τοῖς ἱεροῖς δὲ λογίοις ἐκ παίδων ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδούς. Lib. ii, p. 64, ed. Meineke.

[2] See the excerpts from the acts in the above-cited work of Leo Allatius, lib. ii, c xii, p. 671.

[3] Thus in the copy of the transactions with Niphon, it is said of him, that he pronounced the anathema on the God of the Hebrews. Leo Allat. l. c. p. 682; and John Cinnamos says of him, l. c. p. 64: τὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπροσεποιεῖτο θεόν.

satisfactorily account for it, that they would sanction no other adoration of the cross, except that which was paid to a cross bearing the inscription "Jesus Christ, the Son of God," consequently referring immediately to *Christ himself;* that they declared those miracles said to be wrought by the bare *sign of the cross* a work of the devil, and that they steadfastly opposed all images of saints. The monk Niphon was condemned to perpetual confinement in a monastery. But the patriarch Cosmas, Michael's successor, restored him to liberty; — and he stood high in the estimation of that prelate, insomuch that he made him his confidant and table-companion. The friendship of such a man would lead us to judge favorably of Niphon's character; for all the accounts agree in describing Cosmas as a person of great piety and worth; of a strict life, self-denying love, and a benevolence which gave away everything, to the very raiment which he wore. Similarity of disposition, and a like dissatisfaction with the corrupt state of the Greek church, may perhaps have made Cosmas the friend and protector of Niphon. The only fault that could be found with him was, that his excessive simplicity made him the dupe of that monk.[1] But men could easily avail themselves of the orthodox zeal of the emperor Manuel Comnenus to ruin the monk Niphon; and perhaps the whole was a mere plot contrived for the downfall of Cosmas, who, as patriarch of Constantinople, would be to many an object of envy.[2] As Cosmas would not abandon Niphon, after the latter had been condemned by an *endemic synod*, but persisted in declaring that he was a holy man, the sentence of deposition was passed upon himself. He signified to the synod his abhorrence of the corrupt church, saying that he was like Lot in the midst of Sodom.[3]

We have already mentioned that the Greek emperor John Zimisces had assigned Philippopolis, a city of Thrace, as a seat for the Paulicians. This city was in the twelfth century a place of rendezvous for sects hostile to the church, till the emperor Alexius Comnenus was led by his wars into these districts. He disputed for several days in succession, from morning to evening, with the leaders of these sects, and they brought against him many passages from the Bible. A large number declared themselves convinced, and submitted to baptism; they might calculate on receiving marks of distinction from the emperor. Such as would not be converted he summoned to Constantinople, and gave them a dwelling-place in the neighborhood of the imperial palace. He there continued to labor with them. As a rival to the heretical colony at Philippopolis, he founded a city called after himself, Alexiopolis, in which converted Paulicians and other converted heretics were to settle.[4] But it certainly admits of a doubt whether many of these conversions were sincere, and whether the emperor did not, in spite of himself,

[1] As John Cinnamos says of him: *ἄνθρωπος, πλὴν τοῦ ἀφελοῦς ὡς οἰμαι τἆλλα πάντα πεπλουτηκὼς ἀγαθά.*

[2] According to the account of the historian Nicetas Choniates, lib. ii. p. 106, ed. Bekker, the connection with Niphon was only a pretext; and what had prejudiced the emperor against him was, a suspicion of political intrigue, which the enemies of Cosmas had contrived to excite against him, — a suspicion of intrigue with Isancios, brother of the emperor.

[3] Leo Allat. l. c. p. 686.

[4] See book xiv of Alexias, near the close.

contribute, by the founding of such a pretended orthodox colony, to the spread of the heresies in those very regions, whereby the way was prepared for the transportation of these tendencies into the Western church.

We saw in fact already during the preceding period, how the sects that originated in the East had, amidst the confusions of these centuries, diffused themselves into almost every part of Europe, before they were discovered. By the manifestations just described as occurring in the oriental church itself, and by the lively intercourse between the East and the West, this diffusion of heretical opinions would be still more promoted. There were a set of men who, in the periods of which we speak, went under the name of *Catharists*. The sects which may be traced up to them appear scattered in different countries, under different names, which may serve, partly, to indicate their original extraction, partly to mark the ways of their later dispersion, and partly to hint the causes which procured them an introduction. The most current name is that of Catharists, which indicates their Greek origin, and which they applied to themselves because, as they pretended, they were the only true church. This name should not be confounded with the *Gazzari*, which indicates an origin from Gazzarei, the peninsula of Crimea; as the name *Bulgari*, *Bugri*, indicates an origin from Bulgaria; *Slavoni*, an origin from the midst of the Slavic tribes; *Publicani*, perhaps a mutilation of the name Paulicians, indicates their spread in South France and in Provence, which was called *Novempopulonia*, with allusion to the nickname publicans, *Patarenes*, indicating their connection with that insurrection against the clergy which was provoked by the Hildebrandian principle of reformation itself.[1] The name *Tesserants*, weavers, marks the spread of these sects among the weavers in South France, a class of artisans which in all times seems peculiarly disposed to be carried away by mystical tendencies. Many things in the doctrines and institutions of these sects carry so fresh an oriental impress, akin to the Gnostic, on their very front, that the fact is to be explained only on the supposition of their fresh oriental origin. At the same time, it is evident from what we find reported concerning their doctrines, that they did not rest content with the bare mechanical tradition of what had come to them from the East; but that the principles and doctrines received from abroad were elaborated and wrought over by them in an independent manner. Men who were capable of this must have been found among them, like Johannes de Lugio, for example, who in the thirteenth century is mentioned as an original teacher and author among them. The scientific spirit of the Western church exercised a power over this originally oriental tendency, by the influence of which many peculiar modifications were introduced. Notwithstanding the agreement in certain general principles, in Dualism, and the doctrine of emanation, we still discover oppositions and diversities in their doctrine; — where the question arises, whether they are to be accounted for from an original dif-

[1] See above, p. 94.

ference in the oriental systems at bottom, from which these sects were derived, or from modifications of a peculiar kind, introduced by the later occidental schools.

As it regards the most important difference, the question admits of a very easy decision. This main difference consists in the following particulars: That one party among the Catharists started from an absolute Dualism, assumed the existence of two ground-principles, one opposed to the other, and of two creations corresponding to these principles; while the other party admitted only a relative Dualism, and regarded the evil principle as a spirit fallen from God, who became the author of a revolution in the universe.[1] In the last party we cannot fail to perceive a relationship with the Bogomiles, and their derivation from this sect,—a derivation confirmed also by the apocryphal gospel under the name of the apostle John, which their bishop Nazarius brought along with him from Bulgaria. Now the matter admits, it is true, of being so represented as if the derivation from the Bogomiles was common to the entire sect of Catharists, and as if this view of Dualism was the original one amongst them, while absolute Dualism is to be considered as a later modification introduced in the West. But notwithstanding all the affinity between the systems of the Catharists which sprung out of these two tendencies, still, that fundamental difference is too essential a one, it appears in a form too clearly bearing the impress of its primitive oriental origin, to favor the supposition of such an origin. We might with greater propriety trace many of the affinities in the two classes of Catharists to a later commingling of the sects together, brought about by their common hostility to the dominant church system, and to the monistic principle of dogmatism, in which union their doctrines mutually exerted an influence upon, or passed over into, each other. We may feel ourselves warranted, therefore, to assume the existence of another sect from the East, different from the Euchites, or Bogomiles, as the source whence to derive the other principal party of Catharists. In this case we might first, with contemporary writers, consider Manicheanism as this source, from which the above-mentioned more abrupt Dualistic tendency is to be derived; but the marks of Manicheanism are by no means indisputable.[2] Their doctrine concerning creation, concerning

[1] This is not only apparent from the work, which may be regarded as being the most important source of our knowledge of the doctrines of the Catharists,—the work of the Dominican Moneta, Adversus Catharos et Valdenses, published by Ricchini,—but all the accounts agree in fixing upon it as the main distinction.

[2] The abbot Ecbert of Schönau cites, indeed, in his first sermon against the Catharists (Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxiii, f. 602), a fact which undoubtedly, if well established, would go far to indicate an origin from Manicheanism, namely, that this party celebrated the Manichean festival Bema (see vol. i, sect. iv, p. 505). But that the unknown festival of the Catharists was the Manichean *Bema* is a mere conjecture, refuted by what the writer himself states; for his informer, who had once been a member of the Catharist sect, told him that this festival, which they called Malilosa, took place in autumn. But Mani's festival of the martyrs happened in the month of March. Again, Ecbert cites, it is true (l. c. f. 103), the declarations of Catharists themselves to prove their derivation from Manicheanism, to wit, that they accused Augustin of divulging their mysteries. But neither from this circumstance could so much be inferred. The Catharists, it is probable, had simply allowed themselves

the origin of man, concerning Christ, is by no means a Manichaean one, and we are led much more naturally to think of the Paulicians and other sects related to Gnosticism; though they distinguish themselves from the Paulicians, who, consistent to their original tendency, admitted no opposition of esoterics and exoterics within their body, by the fact that such a distinction actually existed among them.

To speak first of the party which started from an absolute Dualism; they supposed two principles, then, subsisting from all eternity, and two creations corresponding to these principles. The good God they regarded as the primal source of a world of imperishable existence related to himself; while they were of the opinion that all perishable existence, as being null, untrue, could only be traced and referred to the evil principle. With this they united, however, the doctrine of a correspondence of the lower and higher worlds. Everything existing here below, as visible and perishable, they taught, has its correspondent, though under a form adapted to that higher region of existence in the upper world; a view which reminds one of the Manichean doctrine of the pure elements, but which not less finds its analogy in the Gnostic opposition between an original and a represen tative world. In defence of their Dualism, they appealed to many passages of the Old and New Testament; all that is said concerning the opposition between flesh and spirit, world and God, being interpreted by them in this sense. They insisted especially on the passage in John 8: 44, where, as they would have it, the devil is described as one who had never, from the first, stood in truth and goodness.[1] Like their opponents, who regarded Aristotle as the irrefragable authority for all rational truth, they too appealed confidently to his authority as favoring their views.[2] In the processes of nature, these Dualists did not believe it was possible to recognize the self-revealing God. Its unconsciously working, destructive powers, making no difference between good and evil, seemed to them, and this was a point on which both classes of Catharists agreed, to bear testimony of an opposite principle. "How can the fire," said they, "or the water which destroys the dwellings of the poor, of the holy, proceed from the good creation?"[3] The evil principle, Satan, they taught, seized with envy of the good, had exalted himself to the heaven of the latter, and led a third part of the heavenly souls[4] into apostasy. Those heavenly souls they regarded as middle beings between a higher and a lower class. To each soul corresponds a related spirit, of which it is the organ, by which it suffers itself to be determined and guided; and

to fall into the mistake of their adversaries, when they looked upon the Manicheans, combated by Augustin, as their forerunners. Besides, in pointing out the age and originality of their doctrines, they might be very willing to adopt the view which assigned them such predecessors; and because the hypothesis pleased them, they might notice only the resembling points and overlook the rest; and as they rejected the church, and all her authorities, they would be likely to rejoice at any chance of criminating Augustin as a traitor to the truth.

[1] In veritate non stetit, ergo non fuit in ea, ergo fuit semper spiritus mendax, ergo non fuit a bono creatore.

[2] They appealed to the Aristotelian maxim: Contrariorum contraria sunt principia. See Moneta, lib. i, c. iv, § i, f. 44.

[3] L. c. f. 124 et 126.

[4] To which they applied Rev. 12: 4.

each soul also had an organ subordinate to it, a heavenly body, wholly dependent on it, as itself was on that higher spirit.[1] Those spirits were the same as the angels. We may, perhaps, recognize here the *Syzygia* of the Gnostical doctrine. By their apostasy, these heavenly souls forsook the harmonious connection with that higher world. Hurled with Satan from heaven, they were separated from the spirits belonging with them, and from those heavenly bodies which remained behind in heaven, and Satan succeeded to bind them fast in the corporeal world. So it is those fallen heavenly beings, which in their banishment are ever reappearing under the veil of some human body, in which Satan has confined them. This probably has some connection with their doctrine of metempsychosis.[2] On this basis they combated creatianism. They referred to Sirach 18 : 1,[3] and particularly to the word "*simul*," to prove that no new creations took place, and to Deut. 18 : 15; for, so they argued, if the people to whom Moses spake was the same with those who should hear Christ, then they were not a new people who were born in the time of Christ, but the same that lived already in the time of Moses, which also serves to prove that they held to a metempsychosis.[4] But among these heavenly souls they distinguished different classes, according as they belonged to different princes of heaven. The highest class was composed of those who were described as the spiritual Israel, at whose head stood the highest spirit living in the intuition of God, the *ἀνὴρ ὁρῶν τὸν θεόν*, as they understood the name Israel, the *ὁρατικόν, θεραπευτικὸν γένος*. In that name they believed they found a proof of their doctrine, for it certainly referred to such as had seen God. But when and where? Here below it cannot have been; therefore, in an earlier, heavenly existence. The Alexandrian, Gnostic ideas are too plain here to be mistaken.[5] Matth. 15 : 24 might thus be reconciled, they supposed, with John 10 : 16. It was especially to save that highest race of souls, the lost sheep of the house of the heavenly prince Israel, that Christ came; but at the same time to redeem also the souls belonging to other princes of heaven, which are the heathen.[6] These Catharists are said to have denied the freedom of the will. They made it an argument against the doctrine of a free will, determining itself by choice between good and evil, that no such will can be supposed in the case of God. They appealed to the texts in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, employed by others also, in proof of the doctrine of unconditional predestination.[7] It may be questioned, however, whether their opinion on this point has been correctly represented;

[1] Moneta, f. 105.

[2] This doctrine of the fallen souls might already be found among them at the time of the abbot Bernard, when little was known about the secret doctrines of the sect; for this is reported by the abbot Ecbert of Schönau: Novam et hactenus inauditam insaniam de iis compertam habemus, quam manifeste confessi sunt quidam eorum, cum examinarentur a clero in civitate Colonia. Dicebant enim, animas humanas non aliud esse, nisi illos apostatos spiritus, qui in principio mundi de regno coelorum ejecti sunt. L. c. f. 602.

[3] According to the Vulgate: Quod Deus creavit omnia simul.

[4] Moneta, f. 72.

[5] See the passage of Philo, vol. i, p. 48, and the passage cited from the prayer of Joseph, p. 61.

[6] Moneta, lib. i, c. iv, § i, f. 44, seqq.

[7] L. c. lib. i, c. v, f. 64.

for it does not exactly accord with their doctrine of the fall, of repentance, and of the purifying process of fallen souls. Perhaps they only objected to the doctrine which derived evil generally from the creaturely freewill, as they were obliged to do by their Dualism; or to a Theodicy, which referred everything in the progressive development of the earthly life to the free will; while they, on the contrary, believed it must proceed from an original difference of nature, or from the conditions of an earlier existence.[1] They regarded Christ as the highest spirit after God, yet differing from him in essence, and subordinate to him; as they supposed, again, a like subordination between the Son of God and the Holy Ghost. They referred here to those passages of the Old and New Testament which had always been quoted in support of the doctrine of subordination; among others, to Proverbs 8: 22, where they had the reading ἐκτίσατο, not ἐκτήσατο,[2] which again indicates their connection with the older oriental sects. But if it were inferred from this use of the passages cited, that they considered Christ as merely a creature, this would certainly be wrong; since they were undoubtedly in favor of a doctrine of emanation. The Son of God, then, was sent down, so they taught, to overthrow the kingdom of Satan, to release the fallen souls from the bonds of the corporeal world and of Satan, and to bring them back to the community of heaven, to restore them to their original condition. The Son of God united himself to a spirit, soul, and body, in that heavenly world, and so descended, with the annunciation of the angel, into Mary, and again went forth from her.[3] Herself, however, they regarded as a higher spirit, who appeared on earth for the purpose of becoming the instrument or channel for the appearance of the Son of God in humanity. They taught, like the Valentinians, that the heavenly body of Christ was, by a special act of divine power, so modified that it seemed like an earthly one, and could be perceived by the senses. Yet they must explain all sensuous acts and affections, to which Christ subjected himself, as unreal, mere appearances. They maintained, likewise, that all the accounts of the miracles wrought by Christ, were to be understood only in a spiritual sense, as symbols of the spiritual miracles wrought by him.[4] In proof that these accounts should be so understood, they appealed to the words of St. Paul: "The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive." In a dialogue, written probably in the thirteenth century, between a member of this party and an orthodox man,[5] the Catharist, in reply to the question, Why do you work no such miracles as are adduced in the Catholic church, in testimony of its truth and divinity? says: "We perform a miracle when we convert a man to God; then we drive out from him the evil spirits, his sins. We exorcise the poisonous serpents when we drive out these evil spirits; we speak in other tongues, when we set before our hearers

[1] As in the texts concerning Jacob and Esau, in the Epistle to the Romans, ch. ix.

[2] Moneta, f. 235.

[3] Moneta, f. 5 et 232: per aurem intravit and per aurem exivit.

[4] L. c. lib. i, c. ix, f. 99 et 222.

[5] Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum, published by Martene and Durand, in the Thesaur. nov. anecdotor. t. v.

truths never before heard. A covering is still over your souls, who believe that Christ and the apostles wrought visible miracles. The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive. Spiritually we must understand it, and not suppose that Christ called the soul of Lazarus back again to his body, but that he awakened the sinner, one spiritually dead, and passed already, through sin, to putrefaction, by converting him to the faith. So will it happen to you, also, if you will but understand, spiritually, all that is said of the miracles of Christ and of the apostles."[1] The denial of miracles did by no means proceed, in the case of this party of Catharists, from an original tendency of opposition to the supernatural principle; but it grew out of their spiritual Dualism, which led them to regard the sensible world as a work of the evil principle; to disparage, uniformly, the things of sense, and to set little value on deliverance from bodily evils. A kind of miracles quite different from corporeal ones, must be wrought by the representative of the good principle. It belonged to an organ of the evil principle, from which this sensible world proceeds, to perform visible miracles. We may rather look upon these Catharists as the representatives of an ultra supernaturalistic direction, when, instead of contemplating phenomena in the natural connection of cause and effect, we find them representing the powers of the higher world of spirits as everywhere coming into play. While they made the virgin Mary an angel, sent down to the world on a particular errand,[2] a party among them declared the apostle John, whom they especially reverenced, to be an angel who, as Christ said of him that he should remain till he came, was still upon earth.[3] Yet that spiritualizing Docetism might pass over to a rationalistic tendency, setting lightly by or wholly discarding the historical Christ. We find, accordingly, a party among the Albigenses in South France, who taught that the Christ who was born in the earthly and visible Bethlehem, and crucified in Jerusalem, belonged to the evil principle, and they did not hesitate to blaspheme him. The Christ of the good principle they would recognize only as an ideal one, a Christ that never ate nor drank, that never took a real body, that existed in this world only in a spiritual manner, in the person of the apostle Paul;[4] so that the apostle Paul was here exalted above the historical Christ, as his doctrine also was recognized as the genuine spiritual Christianity, the historical appearance of the ideal Christ having first taken place in him. We will not deny that, as this account proceeds from the fiercest enemies of the sect, we might be tempted to consider the whole report as a manufactured conclusion, or a pure invention of heresy-hating spite; but as a representation like this is entirely foreign from the spirit of these times, it is not very probable that a story of this sort would be invented. We find mentioned, again, a party of Catharists

[1] L. c. f. 1750.

[2] According to Martene and Durand, t. v, f. 1722, Mary was an archangel.

[3] The opinion of the Slaves, according to Moneta, l. c. f. 233.

[4] See the Chronicle of Bal Cernay, belonging to the thirteenth century, in Du Chesne Scriptores hist. Franc. t. v, c. ii: Bonus enim Christus nunquam comedit vel bibit nec veram carnem assumsit nec unquam fuit in hoc mundo nisi spiritualiter in corpore Pauli.

under the name *Ordibarii*, who taught that a Trinity first began to exist at the birth of Christ. The man Jesus became Son of God by his reception of the Word announced to him, and he was the son of Mary, not in the corporeal but in a spiritual sense, being born of her in a spiritual manner, by the annunciation of the Word ;[1] and when, by the preaching of Jesus, others were attracted, the Holy Ghost began to exist.[2]

We shall say nothing, in this place, on the doctrine of baptism as held by this party, as it is our intention to omit, here, what both parties have in common with each other. We simply notice that, according to their doctrine, repentance must have respect not only to all single sins, but first of all to that common sin of the souls that fell from God, which preceded their existence in time. This is the consciousness of the apostasy from God, of the inward estrangement from him, and pain on account of this inner aversion to God, as constituting the only foundation of true penitence. As the Gnostics supposed that, by virtue of the new birth, every soul is reunited to its corresponding male half, the higher spirit of the *pleroma*, so the Catharist party of which we are speaking supposed, in this case, a restoration of the relation between the soul and its corresponding *spirit*, from which it had been separated by the apostasy. From this spirit they distinguished the Paraclete, promised by Christ, the *Consolator*, into fellowship with whom one should enter by the spiritual baptism, which they called, therefore, the *consolamentum*. They held that there were many such higher spirits, ministering to the vigor of the higher life. But from all these they distinguished the Holy Spirit, preëminently so to be called, as being exalted above all others, and whom they designated as the *Spiritus principalis*. They held to a threefold judgment : first, the expulsion of the apostate souls from heaven ; second, that which began with the appearance of Christ ; third and last, when Christ shall raise his redeemed to that higher condition which is designed for them.[3] This they regarded as the final consummation, when the souls shall be reunited with the spirits and with the higher organs they had left behind them in heaven.[4] This was their resurrection.

As we find among this party of Catharists many elements of Alexandrian Judaism, so it is possible that these Catharists were, from the first, disposed to admit the authority of the Old Testament, according to the distinction laid down by the Alexandrian Jews, of a literal and a spiritual sense. It is possible, also, that it was not until a later period they were led, in disputing with their adversaries, whom they wished to confute on their own grounds, to admit the authority of the prophets.[5] Another noticeable fact, which also intimates their connection with a Jewish theology, is, that they set great value upon the apoc-

[1] Quod primo tunc Deus pater habuerit filium, quando Jesus suscepit verbum, et dicunt ipsum esse filium virginis, non carnaliter ex ea, sed spiritualiter per praedicationem ejus genitum.

[2] Quando praedicavit Jesus et attraxit alios, tunc primo accessit tertia persona. Rainer contra Waldenses, c. vi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 266.

[3] F. 381. [4] F. 353.

[5] As Moneta says (f. 218), they rejected, at first, all but Isaiah.

ryphal book called the Ascension of Isaiah (*ἀνάβασις τοῦ Ἡσαΐα*), where, in fact, may be found the germs of many of their doctrines; as, for example, the doctrine concerning the heavenly garment of souls, the doctrine of Docetism.[1]

The second class of Catharists did not hold to an evil principle existing from eternity; but, on the contrary, derived all evil and imperfection from the apostasy of a higher spirit. He, they taught, had been made ruler, by the Almighty, over many other spirits, as the case is represented in the unjust steward of the parable, the symbol, in their opinion, of this higher fact. Seized with the desire of casting off the shackles of dependence in which he was held, and of setting up an independent kingdom of his own, he persuaded the stars of heaven, that is, many of the angels, a third part of them, to apostatize with him, promising them that they should be relieved from the heavy burdens and cares of their allotted employments.[2] Out of chaos, which God created as the first matter of all being, he proposed to construct a world of his own. Matter, as these Catharists taught,[3] proceeded from God; the form given to it, from Satan. They allowed, therefore, that God created all things visible potentially.[4] Adam was an angel, sent by the Almighty, to watch Satan, and observe how he proceeded in forming his world. Satan got possession of him, and bound him within the prison of an earthly body. Thus they interpreted the parable of the good Samaritan, Luke x, which also symbolically represented their whole theory. Adam, veiled in a shining robe of light, leaves the heavenly Jerusalem; he is attacked, while on his way, by the fallen spirits in league with Satan, who rob him of his light and throw him into the dark prison of the body. These spirits invested themselves with the robe of light which they took away from man. They are the sun, moon, and stars; for these Catharists, following an ancient notion, looked upon these bodies as intelligences, and intelligences which had fallen. The sidereal kingdom was, to them, a kingdom of evil. So too, following another ancient notion, they recognized in the sun the male, and in the moon the female principle.[5] Regarding all marriage as defiling, they attributed to sun and moon a monthly cohabitation, which they considered the cause of the dew that falls to the earth. Their method of explaining the parable in Matt. xviii, furnishes another illustration of their circle of ideas. The servant with whom God reckons is,

[1] L. c. f. 218: Cujus — of Isaiah — dicunt esse quendam libellum, in quo habetur, quod spiritus Esaiae raptus a corpore usque ad septimum coelum ductus est, in quo vidit et audivit quaedam arcana, quibus vehementissime innituntur, with which we may compare the anathema attributed to the Bogomiles (in J. Tolle, Insigne, etc. p. 116): *Κατὰ τὴν βδελυρὰν ψευδεπίγραφον παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ Ἡσαΐα ὅρασιν.* Dr. Engelhardt has already noticed the fact that the Bogomiles made use of that book, and has referred to the above-quoted passage in J. Tolle. The old Latin version of the book, published by Engelhardt, proves also that it was known and circulated in the Middle Ages. See Engelhardt's Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, s. 27. Erlangen, 1832.

[2] Vide Moneta, f. 111. The hundred measures, in the parable of the unjust steward, they explained as referring to the obligation of repeating a hundred prayers, which the Catharists of those times may have understood literally, though it was originally meant otherwise, — works done to the glory of God being thereby understood.

[3] L. c. f. 118.

[4] L. c. f. 220.

[5] Moneta, f. 110

according to their interpretation, Satan; his wife, wisdom; his sons, the angels subjected to and in league with him. God, moved with compassion towards him, did not deprive him of those higher powers of intelligence (wisdom) with which he had been furnished, his subjects and his goods: so also the Bogomiles taught, that God allowed Satanael to retain his creative power; for Satan had promised that if God would have patience with him, and let him alone, he would produce men enough to make good the whole number of apostate angels. God therefore gave him liberty, for six days, to make whatever he pleased of the corporeal world he had formed; which means, the six thousand years of the world, over which Satan presides. Eve was another angel, whom Satan succeeded to confine in an earthly body, to prepare the way for an intercourse of sexes, whereby the spirit might be brought into entire dependence on sense, and made subservient to his own purposes. From the intercourse of Satan with Eve, Cain was born.[1] The sin of Adam, the eating of the forbidden fruit, consisted in his allowing himself to be enticed into sexual intercourse with Eve; and thus Abel was born.

From the one heavenly soul of Adam, then, all other souls were supposed to be derived. *Traducianism*, at that time indeed generally rejected, was by them defended as the only correct theory; and *creatianism* combated. "If one soul," said they, "is not begotten of another, as the body of the body, the soul belongs not to the human kind, and so Christ is not a redeemer of souls.[2] When it is said of Christ, that he came to save the lost, it could not be understood of new-created souls, which were not yet lost. The doctrine of original sin could not be maintained; it could not be said, that all men sinned in Adam, if they sprang from him only by bodily descent."[3] In opposition to creatianism, they asserted "that, according to this view, a new divine creation must take place, in the case of every illegitimate offspring of adultery.[4] From the same it would follow that God, knowingly and purposely, creates more souls for destruction than for salvation. The great diversity of mental endowments, some being wise, others foolish, would, according to that doctrine, have to be ascribed immediately to God. Would God distribute his gifts so differently?[5] Why should finely-created souls be immersed in these impure vessels, by which they themselves become impure? for, to this contact it would be necessary, according to creatianism, to ascribe the communication of depravity."[6]

According to the doctrine of this party, Satan is the God of the Old Testament. It was he who revealed himself to Abraham, and caused the flood to destroy mankind. God interfered for the preservation of the race: from God proceeded the salvation of Noah. Moses and the

[1] According to Moneta's account, these Catharists supposed that by Satan's succeeding to seduce Adam to cohabit with Eve, Cain was born; yet it would seem probable, when we look at the doctrine of the Bogomiles, that this was a misconception. This is confirmed, moreover, by the language of the Catharists themselves, when Moneta says: "Ut dicunt volentes hoc habere per illud Joann. 1: 30, quod Cain ex maligno erat."

[2] Moneta, f. 129.

[3] L. c. f. 132.

[4] L. c. f. 132.

[5] L. c. f. 135.

[6] L. c. f. 288.

prophets were, according to these Catharists, servants of Satan. Yet they supposed, like the earlier Gnostics,[1] that the prophets were transported by a higher spirit, and sometimes unconsciously prophesied of Christ.[2] But they, unquestionably, spoke with consciousness and understood themselves, when, under the impulse of evil spirits, they predicted war, pestilence, the captivity of the people.[3] Like Marcion, they sought to point out the opposition between the Old and New Testaments; and appealed especially to the opposition between the sermon on the mount and the Mosaic law. The Mosaic law forbade only perjury; the law of Christ, oaths generally. The Mosaic law threatened death to the guilty; the law of Christ forbade the shedding even of innocent blood. They said of the members of the dominant church, that they had sunk back upon the foundation of the Mosaic law.[4] The Catharists, on the other hand, were for restoring the strict observance of the law of Christ. They condemned war, and punishment by death, and would allow no other testimony than a simple yea or nay.

With the prophets they rejected, also, John the Baptist, of whom they said that he was sent by Satan to prevent the baptism of Christ, to set up the baptism of water, in opposition to the spiritual baptism of Christ; but they owned, as in the case of the prophets, that he had sometimes, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, borne witness of Christ, without being conscious of what he said. They traced the contradictory language of the Baptist, therefore, to the circumstance that he spoke, sometimes, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, and sometimes by his own.[5] In proof of the correctness of their views of John the Baptist, they deemed it sufficient to ask, How else came it about, that John did not personally attach himself to Christ, and become his disciple?[6] They appealed to Christ's own words, as bearing witness that John (Matt. 11: 6) took offence at his labors.[7]

In the system of subordination on the subject of the Trinity, they agreed with the other party; except with the difference that they had no scruples in calling Christ and the Holy Spirit God. Also, concerning the person of Christ they taught, like the Bogomiles, that he brought with him from the celestial regions a higher ethereal body. Mary contributed nothing to the production of his human body; but only served as the channel through which he passed. As proof of that higher character of the body of Christ, they referred to his walking upon the water, to his passing through the multitude without any one being able to lay hold on him. In proof of the assertion that Mary was not really the mother of Jesus, they referred to the circumstance that Jesus called her Woman, John 2: 4; and to the texts Matt. 12: 48. Luke 11: 27. They maintained, that the communication of the Holy Spirit took place only after the resurrection of Christ; but in this, the Catharists also of the other party agreed with them.[8]

[1] See what is said respecting their notion of inspiration, in my Church History, vol. i, sect. 2, p. 381.

[2] Si aliquando aliquid boni dixerunt de Christo, coacti a Spiritu Sancto dixerunt. L. c. f. 111.

[3] L. c. f. 218

[4] Vos Romani idem dicitis. Moneta f. 199.

[5] L. c. f. 228.

[6] L. c. f. 230.

[7] L. c. f. 229.

[8] L. c. f. 271.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body they could not admit; for the body having sprung from the evil principle, appeared to them the prison of the soul; and they were obliged to give another interpretation to the passages of the New Testament referring to this point.[1] The text Phil. 3 : 20 was referred to the church, as being the body of humility; for they understood the word here as denoting this ethical conception.[2] They represented, as the final end of all things, the destruction of the creation produced by Satan, and the return of all things to the original chaos. To this chaos, wicked spirits and men should be banished.[3] This they regarded as hell.[4] Then the stars shall be deprived of that light which they had stolen, and the redeemed souls should resume it, since this was the original raiment of the heavenly man.

A point in which both parties of the Catharists agreed, was opposition to the traditional and externalizing element of the dominant church. They were for separating the primitive apostolical truth from later additions; but deeply entangled as they were in their own singular notions, it was quite beyond their power to find any correct criterion by which to effect such a separation. Thus they contended not only against infant baptism, with arguments always readily presenting themselves against the institution as apostolical, but also against water-baptism generally, which Catharists of the second class looked upon as a rite introduced by Satan, through his organ John the Baptist, to the end that he might suppress the true baptism of the Spirit. When it was objected to them that Christ had suffered himself to be baptized by John, they replied: it had been done on the part of Christ by way of accommodation to a prevailing custom, and to avoid giving offence.[5] Others said, in order that, by occasion of it, the hitherto hidden Christ might be revealed. The church, moreover, had for a time used water-baptism, because men were accustomed to that rite,[6] or because it would invite them, by this symbol of water-baptism, to the baptism of the Spirit. They affirmed, that in the sacred Scriptures baptism was a term often employed to express repentance or the preaching of the divine word.[7] The baptism of the Spirit, true baptism, should be performed by the imposition of hands in connection with prayer, which they designated by the term *consolamentum*. In evidence of the power and significance of this act, they referred to the apostles Peter and John, who were sent to

[1] A well-known individual of this party, in the thirteenth century, Desiderius, explained all such passages as relating to the spiritual animation of the body as the organ of the sanctified soul: Quod spiritus sanctus vivificat corpus exterius, quod ab Apostolo dicitur mortale et mortuum ad serviendum rationi, non ad resurgendum. L. c. f. 357.

[2] L. c. f. 362.

[3] L. c. f. 382.

[4] We see the analogy here with the Manichean doctrine; see vol. i, sect. 4, p. 500.

[5] Moneta, f. 279.

[6] L. c. f. 291.

[7] Moneta, f. 288. And the Catharist in the above-cited dialogue in Martene and Durand (tom. v, f. 1726) says: Concedo, quod baptizabat Jesus et discipuli ejus in aqua, id est in praedicatione et spiritu sancto, sed non in aqua corporali. And he then appeals to the fact, that John himself had alluded to the baptism of the Holy Spirit (John vii): ex his collige, quod per aquam intelligitur praedicatio spiritus sancti.

Samaria for the purpose of communicating, by the imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost to those who had received water-baptism. When it was objected to them that it was in contradiction with their own principles, according to which all sensible things proceeded from the evil principle, to attribute so much importance to a sensible act, and represent it as the instrument of an inward operation of divine grace, they replied: The Holy Spirit is communicated, not by the visible but by an invisible hand; the invisible hand is contained under the visible. St. Paul distinguishes an inner and an outer man; and so likewise there must be an inner and an outer hand.[1] This consolamentum seems to have been twofold; the rite of initiation, whereby one was received into the communion of the sect, adopted among the number of the believers (*credentes*); and that whereby he was received into the circle of the fully initiated, into the number of the *perfects*. This latter act was doubtless so called by them in the stricter sense, since it was only by means of it that the new birth and the impartation of the Holy Spirit were effected; as we may gather from the fact that the perfects were distinguished by the epithet *Consolati*.[2] Answering to this consolamentum in the stricter sense, was the rite likewise so called, whereby he who had hitherto belonged only to the number of the *credentes* was, in the hour of death, received into the more limited circle of the sect, so as to be in a condition to enter, immediately after death, into the heavenly world.[3] The consolamentum of adoption into the number of believers was performed, according to a description of the rite drawn up in the twelfth century, after the following manner: "They assembled in a room dark and closed in on all sides, but illuminated by a large number of lights affixed to the walls. Then the new candidate was placed in the centre, where the presiding officer of the sect laid a book (probably the gospel of St. John) on his head, and gave him the imposition of hands, at the same time reciting the Lord's prayer."[4] As it regards the Lord's supper, they were of the opinion that Christ, with the words "This is," pointed to his own body; or they explained the words of the institution in a symbolical sense. "This is," was equivalent to — This signifies. They referred, in proof, to those paragraphs of the New Testament, where the thing itself is mentioned in place of that which it may serve to represent; as, for example, in 1 Corinth. 10 : 4.[5] They referred to the fact, that Christ himself says: "My flesh profiteth nothing; my words are spirit and life," that is, are to be spiritually understood. His *words*, by which he communicates *himself*, are his true body. Moreover, they said, in partaking of the means of nourishment, in communion with Christ as his members, the bread and wine were converted into the body and blood of the Lord. This was to be represented in their love-feasts, at which the presiding officer of the sect imparted the blessing by reciting the

[1] Moneta, f. 126.

[2] Perfecti, qui consolati vocantur in Lombardia. Rainer contra Catharos, c. vi, Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 266.

[3] Rainer, c. vi, f. 272.

[4] Ecbert, sermon. contra Catharos, c. viii, f. 615. Here too it is impossible to mistake the affinity of the Catharists with the Bogomiles.

[5] Moneta, f. 296.

Lord's prayer.[1] They combated the doctrine of the sacrament of penance, of the necessity of a satisfaction for sins committed after baptism; according to their own doctrine, the consolamentum was a substitute for all other penance. When the members of the sect came to the bishop for the purpose of confessing their sins, they prostrated themselves before him, after the manner of the East. Each person said, "Have mercy upon us, O Lord. I never must die; but must inherit of thee, that I may have a good end." The bishop then bestowed on each, with the imposition of his hands, the consolamentum; thrice repeating, "And that thou mayst be a good man."[2] Many Catharists appealed to the fact that Christ, the great High Priest, enjoined no works of satisfaction on the woman caught in adultery.[3] Contending against the externalization of religion in the dominant church, they said: God dwells not in houses made with hands. It is not the house of stone, but the good man and the good woman, and the community of such, that constitutes the church.[4] Prayer in the church is no better than prayer in the closet. It is better to clothe the poor than to decorate the walls of a church. Yet we are not to suppose that this sect held on in the true direction to an interior vital Christianity. On the contrary, they united with their mystical element another species of externalization. To the consolamentum was ascribed a magical efficacy; the fellowship of heaven was made as dependent upon it as it was in the dominant church on the priestly acts. We recognize the same tendency of the times, in those cases where laymen of the Catholic church eagerly put on, at the very hour of death, the monkish cowl, in order to make sure of salvation, and in those cases where others were eager to obtain, in the very hour of death, the consolamentum by the Catharists, and to be buried among them.[5] If men elsewhere sought to make themselves more certain of the forgiveness of their sins by bequests to the clergy and

[1] Ecbert, l. c. f. 602: Se solos in mensis suis corpus Domini facere dicunt, verba sancta dicunt esse panem, quia cibus animae sunt verba evangelica. Ebrardus contra Catharos, c. viii. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxiv, f. 1547. See the dialogue betwixt the Catholic and the Catharist in Martene and Durand, t. v. f. 1730.

[2] The German words, "Und werdest ein gut Mann," are so given by Rainer, c. vi, Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 272.

[3] Moneta, f. 306: Quidam garruli objiciunt dicentes, quod Christus summus sacerdos et pontifex secundum ordinem Melchisedek nulla satisfactionis opera injunxit mulieri in adulterio deprehensae.

[4] Ebrard. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxiv, f. 1537. Rainer, c. v. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 266.

[5] In the Chronicle of Puy Lorent, the following anecdote is related. Bishop William, of Alby, in South France, received a message in the night from Pierre de Beres, a knight notorious for robbery, and other crimes, who was a kinsman of his, requesting him to come to his castle, some hours distant, the knight being very sick and near to death, and wishing to speak with him on certain affairs, before he left the world. When the business was finished for which the bishop had been summoned, the latter asked the knight where he wished to be buried, naming several consecrated places. The knight replied, he needed give himself no trouble about that matter, for he had already made up his mind on the subject. When the bishop pressed him further, he declared that it was his wish to be conveyed to a community of the Catharists. The bishop now assured him that this would not be allowed; but said the knight, "Better give yourself no trouble about it; for if I could not do otherwise, I would crawl to them on all fours." See the Chronicon magistri Guilelmi de Podio Laurentii, c. iii, in Du Chesne Scriptores hist. Franc. t. v, f. 668.

to the churches, bequests to the communities of the Catharists were made on precisely the same principle.[1] We may believe, therefore, that as the former suffered themselves to be misled, by trusting in the outward things of the church, into a false security; so the same effect was produced on the latter, by reliance on the consolamentum in the hour of death.[2] In fact, the externalization in the Catharistic doctrine of the consolamentum, which stood them in place of all the sacraments, may have been pushed farther than it was in the church doctrine of the sacraments. While the necessity of the consolamentum was unconditionally asserted, for instance, by the Catharists, the *votum* might serve on the contrary, according to the doctrine of the church, as a substitute for the sacraments, when they were unavoidably omitted.[3] In the case of such a sect, limited to itself, this principle of externalization, having once gained a foothold, would be the more likely to be pushed to an extreme, as those manifold tendencies of the religious spirit in different directions were here absent, which, acting as a check on each other, preserved the Catholic church from too stiff a uniformity and too downright one-sidedness. It is quite evident, also, how little capable the Catharists were of understanding their own straightness and confinement, by comparing it with the manifold diversity which distinguished the Catholic church of this period, when we find them proceeding on the principle, that there is but one uniform way of salvation, which was to be found in their own sect alone, and hence regarding that manifoldness as a reproach to the church, as a proof that she did not know the one only way of salvation.[4]

Although the Catharists, in opposing the authority of church tradition,[5] the hierarchy, the worship of saints and images, the value of pilgrimages, are precursors of the Protestant principle, still it is evi

[1] See the words of Moneta, f. 393: Nonne tua synagoga legata recipit mortuorum? Nonne aliquoties cum aliquis moritur, recepta manuum impositione a te, legat ecclesiae tuae tantum vel tantum et alii totidem aut plus vel minus. Which is also confirmed by other evidence.

[2] As is shown in the above-stated example.

[3] Hence Moneta, from this starting-point, impugns, in connection with the church mode of thinking, the externalization which was carried to such extremes. See Moneta, f. 304, col. 2, where he cites against it the example of the thief on the cross.

[4] Quod unica est via ad salvationem secundum Christum, Joann. 14, 6, cum ergo via ecclesiae Romanae multiplex sit, alia enim est via monachorum, alia canonicorum regularium, et alia clericorum aliorum, alia fratrum praedicatorum, alia minorum, ecclesia Romana non est de via salutis. Moneta, lib. v, c. i, f. 396. So likewise Ebrard. contra Catharos, c. xix: Dicunt unam tantum salutis esse viam, ad quam ipsi prae caeteris devenerunt. Nesciunt enim, quod plures viae ad unam deveniunt viam. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxiv, f. 1563.

[5] Rainer says, particularly, they did not receive the writings of the fathers; but the four evangelists having written, as they said, in a saving way, because they had written upon the heart, these they received — sed tantum moraliter exponunt; an expression too general, correctly applying only to those spiritualizing Catharists. The other four, say they, had written unprofitably, because they only wrote on the lifeless parchment, namely, Jerome, Augustin, Ambrose, and Bernard. The writings of these fathers they despised, and said of them that they were damned. It deserves to be noticed, however, that they are said to have made an exception here of St. Bernard, eo quod ipse conversus ab errore suo sit et salvatus. What may have led them to make this exception? The kindred mystic element, or the way in which he protected the Catharists from the bloodthirsty rage of the populace? See Rainer, contra Catharos, c. vi; Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 267

dent from what has been said, that in other respects they are the farthest possible removed from it; and among these may be mentioned the great importance they gave to works as a condition of salvation. Their opponents combated them on this very point, and set up faith and grace in opposition to the merit of works. It is from this point of view that Eberhard of Schönau, in attacking them, gives the priority to faith; because, where there is faith, works will invariably follow of themselves, while with works faith is not necessarily given.[1]

From the principles of the Catharists proceeded a rigidly ascetic system of morality, to the observance of which, however, none but the perfects were obligated. Those principles required abstinence from meat, eggs, and cheese; from everything that is the product of the sexual intercourse of animals. Perhaps only by a part it was held unlawful to kill animals, or certain species of animals.[2] This probably stood in some connection with their doctrine of metempsychosis. They condemned marriage, so far as connected with sexual intercourse; for, according to the doctrine of one party of the Catharists, this is the very means whereby the heavenly souls are continually confined anew in the corporeal world, while, according to the other, this intercourse was the capital sin into which Adam suffered himself to be beguiled by the evil spirit. The words of Christ: "What God has joined together let no man put asunder," the more Dualistic Catharists explained of the spiritual marriage between Christ and the church:[3] and accordingly they permitted only a spiritual marriage, without sexual intercourse.

To the Esoterics and Exoterics in this sect correspond the two classes of *perfecti*, or *boni homines*, who were called Catharists in the stricter sense, and the *credentes*. According to the testimony of Rainerio Sacchoni, who wrote against the Catharists, in the first half of the thirteenth century, there were countless numbers in all quarters of the world, who belonged to the second class; but only four thousand of both sexes belonging to the class of the "perfect." A numerical statement of this sort, relating to a sect that propagated itself in secret, is of course a matter of uncertainty, still, the statement becomes more probable when we are informed that he himself had been for seventeen years a member of the sect.[4] He refers, moreover, to a census repeatedly taken among themselves; and notwithstanding opposite parties existed among them, such a census might very well have been made; for, in spite of these differences, they still mutually acknowledged one another as belonging to the same community.[5] The *perfects* stood in the same kind of relation to the entire sect, as the *elect* in the sect of the Manicheans. They

[1] In operibus solummodo confidentes, fidem praetermittunt, cum fides operibus potius sit praeponenda. He appeals to the fact that to the question (John vi): Quid faciemus, ut operemur opera Dei? Christ answered, Hoc est opus Dei, ut credatis in eum, quem misit ille. Ecce, quod credere hic appellat operari, omnis enim, qui credit, operatur, sed non omnis, qui operatur, credit, fides enim praecellit operibus. Ebrard. contra Catharos, c. xvi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxiv, f. 1558.

[2] Rainer, c. vi, t. xxv, f. 268.

[3] Moneta, f. 341.

[4] Rainer, f. 267.

[5] Omnes ecclesiae Catharorum recipiunt

represented themselves as being persons who in utter poverty, amidst constant persecutions, wandering about without a settled home, truly copied the life of Christ and of the apostles, while the walk of the worldly-minded clergy was in direct contradiction to that life.[1] From the number of these perfects, as in the case of the Manichaeans, were chosen the presiding officers of the sect; first, a bishop; then under him a filius major and a filius minor; finally, a deacon.[2] It deserves to be noticed, that several were destined from their childhood to the office of bishop, and educated for this purpose, who received for their food no other milk than the milk of almonds, and no flesh but fish, and who were obliged to observe the rigid diet of the perfects.[3] But an opposition of this sort, so entirely at variance with the essence of the Christian life, could only be injurious in its influence on that life, so that the higher the requisitions made on the strict living of the *perfects*, the greater would be the disposition to overlook the failings of the *credentes*. Yet how shall we reconcile it with the above statement that, according to the testimony of the first opponents themselves, it was their blameless and strict mode of life that distinguished the Catharists generally; that they abstained from cursing and swearing, and a simple yea or nay was a substitute with them for the strongest attestations. It may be, that it was not till after the sect had become more widely spread and acquired a proselyting spirit, that this opposition between the moral life of the perfects and of the believers became more prominent, and the standard of conduct required of the latter was lowered down. But it may be, too, that those who were no better than the great mass of the dominant church, did not belong to the believers among the Catharists, but to the Catechumens, the *auditores;* that the opponents of the Catharists, who noticed only the distinction between the perfects and the believers, failed duly to distinguish the Catechumens from the latter, and many things which might be true of the Catechumens came to be transferred to the believers.[4] And so it may have been these auditors, who put off the consolamentum which they were bound to receive, till the hour of death, in the expectation that they might then pass over, purified from all their sins, into the higher world. It is plain, at least, from the report of the proceedings of the inquisition at Toulouse,[5] published by Philip of Limborch, which contains the trial of several men and women belonging to the sect of the Catharists, that such persons entered into an agreement[6] with the presiding officer of the same, in virtue of

se invicem, licet diversas habeant opiniones et contrarias. L. c. f. 271.

[1] See e. g. the letter of the provost Everwin of Steinfeld, giving a report to abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, of the Catharists, discovered in the region of Cologne, in the 3d vol. of Mabillon's Analecta, in the octavo ed.

[2] Rainer, f. 269.

[3] Nutrientes cum lacte amygdalino et pecudis, in Rainer, f. 272, should read, without doubt: et non pecudis.

[4] The provost Everwin of Steinfeld, in the above-mentioned letter, distinguishes the following three classes: Prius per manus impositionem de numero eorum, quos auditores vocant, recipiunt quemlibet inter credentes et sic licebit eum interesse orationibus eorum, usquedum satis probatum eum faciunt electum.

[5] In the Appendix to his Historia Inquisitionis. Amstelodami, 1692.

[6] Called La convenensa.

which they were to be received into the sect by the consolamentum, that so being delivered from all their sins they might pass at once into paradise.[1] This is explained to mean that they were then first received into the sect.[2] The presiding officers of the Catharists were called to visit the sick, for the purpose of performing some rite upon them, whereby they were to be incorporated into the sect and so made partakers of salvation;[3] that is, without doubt, to bestow on them the consolamentum. Cases occurred where persons who, in sickness, had been led by the fear of death to resolve on getting themselves received into the sect, and to whom the presiding officer had already been called for this purpose, fell back from their purpose on finding themselves getting better.[4] It is true, Rainer so represents the matter as if those who were already believers would, when near their end, in order to secure salvation, make over all their property and wholly devote themselves to the sect.[5] However this may be, we must conceive the matter in the sense of the Catharists, which was as follows: whether one belonged before his death to the class of Catechumens or of believers, it was only by resolving on and binding himself to that renunciation of the world which was required of the *perfects*, that he could hope to enter into the kingdom of heaven: for what the Manicheans said of their *elect*, the same was said by the Catharists of their *perfects*, that to belong to their number was a necessary transition-point to reunion with heaven.[6] Such began, therefore, even in their sickness, a strictly ascetic life. They must bind themselves to drink nothing but water, especially to abstain from milk, and not to allow any woman to come too near them.[7] If one who had received the consolamentum, allowed himself afterwards to eat anything forbidden, he must be comforted over again, which was the *reconsolatio*.[8] We recognize the gloomy ascetic spirit of downright Dualism,[9] the genuinely oriental spirit, reminding us of the self-annihilation of the Hindoo, in

[1] In the above-mentioned protocol, f. 29: Fecit pactum haereticis, quod ipsi vocant la convenensa, quod peteret haereticos, in infirmitate sua, ut reciperent eam et salvarent animam ipsius et si evaderet, quod servaret et teneret vitam et sectam ipsorum et observantias. F. 111, the words of a leader of this sect: Quod in ipso erat salvatio et si aliquis in fine suo reciperet ab ipso ordinationem, salvabatur, et ibat in paradisum.

[2] The occurring expression haereticari, f. 22, the convenensa pactum, quod reciperetur in fine per eos ad sectam ipsorum.

[3] F. 20: Ut facerent aliquid, per quod salvaretur in ordine ipsorum.

[4] F. 15 to one called, ad haereticandum quemdam infirmum, sed non fuit haereticatus, quia invaluit, and other like cases.

[5] Credentibus ipsorum nullam dant spem salutis, nisi ad ipsorum sectam relictis omnibus convertantur et saltem in extremo vitae articulo manus impositionem ab ipsis accipiant. Dicunt enim, omnia peccata per manus impositionem ab ipsis factam relaxari et spiritum sanctum infundi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 272.

[6] Thus, in that protocol of the Inquisition at Toulouse (f. 152), it is said of a person, who was for going over to the Catharists, that he betook himself to such an one, ut addisceret vitam et sectam dicti haeretici et quod volebat et proponebat esse et fieri haereticus perfectus seu vestitus, sicut ille erat, qui vocant se bonos homines.

[7] Of such an one, f. 59: Quod non daret aliquem cibum cum pinguedine nisi aquam ad bibendum, and f. 104, of a little daughter, who, as being haereticata, had bound herself to drink no milk.

[8] L. c. f. 59: Iterum reconsolatus, quia peccaverat comedendo.

[9] Probably these things were done only by the Catharists who espoused the doctrine of absolute Dualism; the doctrines which occur in the protocol of the Inquisition at Toulouse, point throughout to *this* party.

the case of those who after having finally received the consolamentum, resigned themselves to death by starvation, which was called the *endura*, hoping thus to pass the more certainly to, or to secure a higher place in, the kingdom of light, or in other ways sought an imaginary martyrdom,[1] men and women, taking their places in the bath, and opening their own veins, or poisoning themselves, as with the juice of the wild cucumber.[2] It is true, the fury with which the Catharists were persecuted in the thirteenth century may have contributed to promote among them this fanatical seeking after death; and we meet with examples which show that they inflicted death on themselves in these ways, to avoid falling victims to the inquisitions.[3] But still, there is not the least warrant for asserting that this sickly hatred of life, which has its ground in the whole Dualism and orientalism of this sect, was only and for the first time called forth by the persecutions.

The Catharists were zealous in disseminating their principles everywhere; they were careful to improve every favorable circumstance for this purpose, and seized upon every occurrence which could serve as means to it. Among the favorable circumstances, belonged especially the contests between emperors and popes; the schisms between state and church, whereby the introduction and spread of their tenets were particularly favored. This was the case, for example, during the disputes between the Hohenstaufen emperors and the popes, in Italy, and the countries on the Rhine.[4] When a country was laid under the interdict, the dissatisfaction and the religious necessities of the laity gave them better opportunity than they usually enjoyed to enlarge their sect.[5] Humbert de Romanis, in exhorting the companions of his order to a more zealous discharge of their predicatorial duties, in a work already mentioned by us, could hold up for their imitation the example of the heretics, who at the peril of their lives

[1] Ponere se in endura et facere bonum finem. In the above protocol, f. 138.

[2] Such cases occurred in various forms in the Toulouse protocol: Of a woman, it is said: In sua ultima aegritudine compos mentis existens in sectam recepta fuit, consolamentum per impositionem manuum petens, et recipiens ab iisdem, et legatum ipsis fecit, et ipsamet persolvit iisdem, et sic recepta per haereticos in abstinentia, quam ipsi vocant enduram, multis diebus perdurans sectam ipsorum servando, se fecit tanquam haereticam more ipsorum adorari, mortemque corporalem sibi accelerans, sanguinem minuendo, balneum frequentando potumque letiferum ex succo cucumerum silvestrium, immisso in eo vitro fracto, quo frangerentur ejus viscera, in fine. L. c. f. 33. A juice prepared from the seeds of the wild gourd (wild cucumber) called by the ancients elaterium, used in certain quantities as a medicine, a cathartic, was in larger doses fatal: "Copiosius necat," says Pliny, Hist. natur. lib. xx, c. iii. The declaration so often occurring in the protocol of Toulouse serves to confirm what Rainer reports, though all he says is not to be regarded as literally true. He states that the Catharists left it at the option of the sick whether they would belong to the martyrs or to the confessors. He who chose the first was strangled; he who chose the second, was left to die of hunger. T. xxv, f 272.

[3] Instrumentum ferreum, quod dicta Guilelma fecerat emi, cum quo perforaretur in latere subito, si venirent nuncii inquisitorum. In the above-mentioned protocol, f. 76.

[4] Thus in the quarrel betwixt Alexander the Third and Frederic the First; see Thomas Cantipraten. Apes, lib. i, c. v, p. 23, the contested imperial election between Philip and Otho under Innocent the Third; see Caesar. Heisterbac. Distinct. v, c. xxi f. 138.

[5] See Thomas Cantipraten. l. c

travelled about from village to village and from house to house.[1] As merchants, they frequented fairs and markets, and converted the intercourse of trade into a means of finding opportunities and occasions for introducing their doctrines among the multitudes who flocked together at these places.[2] They also sent young men of their community to the then metropolis of all scientific culture at Paris, for the purpose of learning there the dialectical arts, which they were to apply in refuting the doctrines of the church and in defending their own; and to seek occasions of exerting an influence on the academical youth.[3] Among their believers were many tradesmen, who had accumulated handsome fortunes.[4] These had it in their power to bestow largely on the members of their party, and to show hospitality to all the brethren coming from a distance. The feature that so much distinguished the first Christian communities, seemed to have revived again in this party, more closely bound together as they were by the persecutions. The above-mentioned Humbert, general of the Dominicans, holds them up likewise to the Catholics, as patterns for imitation in respect to the zeal with which they made collections for their indigent brethren in the faith.[5] Their adversaries expatiate on the ample support which every one that professed their peculiar principles found among them, as a means by which attachment to those principles was especially promoted.[6] As in the first ages of Christianity, every Christian who

[1] Haeretici cum periculo corporis non cessant per domos et villas discurrere, ut pervertant animas. De eruditione praedicatorum, lib. v, c. xxxi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 447.

[2] See a letter of pope Innocent the Third to French bishops, warning them against certain Catharists: Qui tempore praedecessoris tui, cum essent haeretici, a villa fugere praedicta *sub mercationis obtentu* nunc adeunt loca suspecta et per tres aut quatuor menses commorantes ibidem, cum redeunt, secum adducunt sani dogmatis perversores. — An eye-witness says of the Catharists in Italy: Multos mercatores hac intentione mittunt ad nundinas, ut pervertant divites laicos commensales et hospites, cum quibus loquendi familiariter indulgetur facultas ut multipliciter negociantes. aliorum pecunias hinc sibi lucrentur, inde animas nihilominus thesaurizent Antichristo. See the letter of Yves of Narbonne, in Matthew of Paris, f. 538. This report is an important source of information respecting the occupations followed by the Catharists. The above Yves was an ecclesiastic of Narbonne, who had been accused of heresy before the papal legate, and fear induced him, though conscious as he says of no guilt, to abscond. As a man persecuted by the church on account of heresy, he everywhere met with a very hospitable reception in the communities of the Catharists in Italy, though as a man whose sole aim in living was gratifying his lusts, he availed himself of this hospitality only to enjoy himself at their expense, without sharing their convictions. He drew up a report of what came under his notice while living amongst the Catharists, for bishop Gerald of Bourdeaux, in the above-cited letter.

[3] Thus, in the above-cited letter, it is said: Quod ex omnibus fere civitatibus Lombardiae et quibusdam Thusciae Parisios dociles transmisissent scholares, quosdam Logicis cavillationibûs, alios etiam Theologicis dissertionibus insudantes, ad ædstruendos ipsorum errores et professionem apostolicae fidei confutandam.

[4] When they boasted of following the apostles in evangelical poverty, which to be sure could hold good only of the "perfect," this was objected to them; as, for example, by Moneta: Nusquam invenitur in novo testamento, quod apostoli essent negotiatores, et quod pergerent ad nundinas causa negotiationis terrenae (where, however, as we have seen, they had another object in view) et quod anhelarent pecuniam cumulandam, sicut vos facitis. quomodo ergo illorum viam tenetis? Lib. v, c. i, f. 396.

[5] Tanta est haereticis cura de auditoribus suis, quod non cessant discurrere et congregare eleemosynas, ut de ipsis sustentent credentes suos pauperes et allicianr alios socios suos ad credendum. Lib. i, c xli, f. 452.

[6] Si pauper fueris et mendicus, moram

brought with him a letter of recommendation from his community was certain of meeting a hospitable reception from his brethren in the faith, so any one belonging to the sect of the Catharists, when recommended by one of their communities, might expect to meet with a kind reception everywhere among the Catharists. Let him travel in Italy, or in South France, he was sure of finding everywhere whatever he needed, in abundance;[1] a custom, to be sure, liable to be abused by impostors.[2] In particular, the perfects, when on their travels, were received into the houses of all believers with great demonstrations of respect. The inmates thrice bowed the knee, to receive their blessing. The members of the sect in the whole place speedily assembled at the house where they were entertained; and perhaps others also, who were not liable to be suspected as informers, were invited in, to hear them preach and expound the Scriptures.[3] Commencing with the inculcation of practical truths, against which no one could have a word to object, with making known and explaining the New Testament which was withheld from the laity, the Catharist preachers prepared the way for pointing out the contradictions between the doctrines of the New Testament and those of the church; and after having gradually shaken the confidence of their audience in the latter, they began to set forth their own opinions among hearers whose confidence they had gained for themselves. In South France, they took in the daughters of indigent noblemen and educated them for nothing. These were thus won over to their doctrines, and by their means these doctrines might be disseminated and spread in families.[4] When the defenders of the church doctrine spoke of the miracles of ancient and modern times as testimonies to the truth of these doctrines, the Catharists pronounced such miracles to be frauds or works of sorcery, performed by the evil principle for the advancement of his own kingdom.[5] To convince the people that it was all a trick, many of the Catharists feigned themselves sick or possessed of devils, and pretended to seek relief at the hand of some famous and venerated worker of miracles; and if the latter happened to be taken in by

cum illis facias, statim exies opulentus, quippe a diluculo ad crepusculum in mundanis operosi mercaturis, manus non permittunt otiari. Ebrard. c. xxii, t. xxiv, f. 1566.

[1] It seems that the houses of the Catharists could be distinguished by certain marks known to individuals of the sect, and concealed from all others. It is reported of the Catharist Punzilovo, presently to be mentioned, that, in returning from Rimini, he remarked to some one, that the Catharists had many houses there; and on being asked, how he knew, he replied: Ego bene cognosco eas, quia habent aliqua signa, per quae cognosco eas. These marks, however, he would not discover to any one. See the acts relating to this Punzilovo in Muratori antiquitates Italicae medii aevi, t. v, ed. fol. 131.

[2] As in the case of the above-mentioned Yves, who says of his reception amongst the Catharists at Cremona: Nobilissima Paterinorum bibi vina, radiolas et ceratia et alia illecebrosa comedens, deceptores decipiens.

[3] As often occurs in the protocol of the Inquisition at Toulouse.

[4] Humbert, lib. ii, c. xlviii, f. 480: In partibus Albigensium nobiles pauperes tradebant filias suas haereticis ad sustentandas eas et eruiendas et sic fiebant haereticae. To counteract this influence, the Dominicans determined to erect a convent on the spot, particularly for the education of the daughters of the nobility.

[5] See the work of Lucas Tudensis (bishop Lucas of Tuy) adversus Albigenses, lib. i. Bibl. patr. Ludg. t. xxv, f. 195.

them, they afterwards discovered to the astounded multitude the true course of the thing, exclaiming, "Here you have a living example! As it was all a trick in this case, so will it be in every other in which you may allow yourselves to be duped."[1] They spread abroad reports of miraculous cures which had been wrought in filthy spots, or where the bones of some culprit or heretic had been buried. They contrived — which was no difficult thing in those times — to bring it about that vast crowds of people would flock to these spots. Then they discovered the trick, thus seeking to stagger the people in their faith, or to involve them in controversy with their clergy, when these sought to abate the evil.[2] Catharists who appeared in mean apparel, with pallid countenances, who wore the marks of self-mortification on their persons might, before they were recognized as heretics, become highly venerated among the people, and artfully avail themselves of this circumstance to gain the credit also of being miracle-workers; so that it must have been very difficult for the clergy to counteract their influence.[3]

Near the close of the thirteenth century, a man who had contributed much to the spread of this sect in Italy, came very near being canonized. Armanno Punzilovo was a rich and respectable citizen of Ferrara, descended from a family of Catharists, and had himself been received among the *consolati*, or *perfects*. He stood in close connection with their communities in the different cities of Italy; frequently entertained them, and held meetings with them in his house. He had been suspected by the Inquisition; but he contrived to deceive them; for he hypocritically bore his part in the Catholic worship, and regularly confessed, with all apparent devoutness, to his Catholic guides. Through a long life he had won universal respect for his piety, his strict morality, and benevolence, when in 1269 he died, and multitudes soon flocked to his tomb, since he was regarded as a saint. Many reports were spread abroad of the wonderful cures performed there; which are to be explained in the same way as other like appearances of this period; perhaps, too, the sly hand of the artful Catharists may have occasionally intermeddled here. For a series of years minutes of the miracles were made out and received, falling in no respect behind the protocols of the miracles wrought by other saints, which had secured their canonization; and the proposition was made even at Rome to canonize Punzilovo. But in the course of the

[1] Thus they endeavored to counteract the influence of the Dominican Peter of Verona, a zealous persecutor of heretics, who had great power with the people, and who fell in this contest, A. D. 1252. See his life, Mens April, t. iii, c. ii, § 18, f. 691.

[2] An example of this sort is related by Lucas Tudensis, lib. iii, c. viii: Quod callide fecerant, quibusdam detegentes haeretici deridebant fidem Catholicam et simili artificio fieri miracula in ecclesia coram sanctorum corporibus affirmabant. Then, how the ecclesiastics and monks, who at first encouraged the devotion of the people, and built a house there for the devout, afterwards stood forth in opposition to it, instabant fratres minores et clerici, ne populi vota sacrilega in loco sordido immundis ossibus exhiberent, et magis accendebantur animi laïcorum ad cultum diabolicum peragendum et fratres praedicatores et minores ac clericos universos, quia erant contrarii suis operibus, haereticos condamnabant.

[3] Examples in Caesarius of Heisterbach, Distinct. v, c. xix, f. 138, and ix, c. xii, f. 270.

proceedings for this purpose, remarks of his on careful inquiry gradually came to light, which increased the suspicions against him to certainty, and the result of the whole finally was that, in 1301, instead of being declared a saint, he was condemned as an heresiarch, and his body disinterred and removed.[1]

The most absurd reports of unnatural excesses, and other abominations, said to be committed in the secret assemblies of the sect, were spread among the multitude; accusations similar to those brought against the primitive Christians, afterwards against the Jews, and such as are ever wont to be repeated against all opponents of a dominant religion. The fanatical multitude exercised a speedy justice, hurrying away such people at once to the stake. So it happened at the beginning of this period, in the countries on the Rhine and in France. The people, in such cases, sought to anticipate the orderly investigations of the clergy, fearing they would be too gentle.[2] The abbot Bernard of Clairvaux protested against these tumultuary proceedings of the multitude: "We praise the zeal," says he, "but we do not advise to such hasty action; for faith must come from conviction, must not be forced;[3] although we admit it were better that false teachers should be restrained by the power of the sword than that they should be allowed to mislead multitudes into their error, yet only by the sword of the magistrate, which God has ordained for this purpose."[4] And in another sermon he says: "They should be captured, not with arms, but with arguments, by which their errors would be exposed and refuted; and they themselves reconciled, if possible, with the Catholic church, would be led back to the true faith; for such is the will of him who wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. It should be the great aim of one skilled in church doctrine, whenever he is called to conduct disputes with a heretic, so to convince the errorist that he may be converted, never forgetting the words of the apostle James (5: 20). But if such an one will not be convinced," says he, "it were better to drive him away, or even to place him in custody, than to leave the whole vineyard to be laid waste by his means."[5]

Hildegard,[6] who was zealous in her opposition to these people, as a race by whom the whole country was polluted, who looked upon them as instruments for the punishment of a corrupt clergy,[7] declared that they ought to be deprived of their goods, and driven far away from the church, but that they ought not to be killed,— for even in them

[1] See the remarkable transactions in Muratori antiquitates Italicae medii aevi, t. v, folio edition.

[2] An example of this sort is given by the abbot Guibert Novigent., in the third book of his life, c. xiv: Fidelis interim populus clericalem verens mollitiem, etc.

[3] Fides suadenda est, non imponenda.

[4] In Cantica Canticorum, Sermo. lxvi, § 12, t. i, f. 1499.

[5] Ex hoc jam melius, ut quidem ego arbitror, effugatur aut etiam religatur, quam sinitur vineas demoliri. In Cantica Canticorum, Sermo. lxiv, § 8, f, 1486.

[6] See above, p. 217.

[7] Without doubt, the picture of these people, as they then appeared, hovered before her imagination, when she writes: Populus iste a diabolo seductus et missus pallida facie veniet et velut in omni sanctitate se componet et majoribus secularibus principibus se conjunget. Letter to the clergy in Cologne, p. 166. Epistolae Hildegardis, Colon. 1566.

the image of God must be respected.[1] The last person who declared against punishing the Catharists with death was the pious Peter Cantor. He cites the example of pope Eugene the Third and of archbishop Samson at the council of Rheims, in 1148. A Manichean, who was brought to confess his errors, had, by the decision of the council, not been killed nor corporeally punished; but that others might not be misled by him, and that he himself might, if possible, be brought to repentance, he was confined in a cell, and there maintained on a meagre diet till he died.[2]

When the Catharists were asked by the bishops concerning their doctrines, they were fond of giving indefinite and evasive answers, and begged not to be too closely pressed.[3] They could get along by tacitly understanding the articles of faith in another sense,[4] as was actually done in the case of the articles relating to the Trinity, to Mary as the mother of God, to the miracles of Christ, to the future resurrection, and to baptism.[5] It is worthy of notice that the same people who did not hesitate to deceive their judges by ambiguous explanations, or some sort of mental reserve, yet understanding, as they did, the prohibitions of the sermon on the mount literally, felt the most anxious scruples against taking an oath. The perfects might be known by the fact,

[1] Quoniam forma Dei sunt. In the epistola ad Moguntinenses, p. 138.

[2] Verbum Abbreviatum, p 200.

[3] As in that trial referred to by Guibert, when, after they had explained themselves generally on the subject of baptism, and they were urged to speak out more distinctly, they answered: Propter Deum ne nos adeo profunde scrutari velitis.

[4] Rainer says: Index cautus sit circa tales, quia sicut anguilla, quanto fortius stringitur, tanto facilius elabitur, sic in omni responsione hæreticorum invenies duplicitatem. L. c. t. xxv, f. 274.

[5] When the Catharists were examined before the council at Lombez (Lumbariense), in South France, A. D. 1165, they stuck to the principle in their first answers to the bishops, of acknowledging no doctrine save what could be proved from the New Testament; and in relation to particular doctrines gave indefinite and evasive answers. When, e. g. they were asked about infant baptism, they declared they would say nothing further, but only answer from the gospels and the epistles. When asked about the body and blood of our Lord in the eucharist, they answered at first, as they might properly do, from their own point of view, that whosoever partook of it worthily was blessed, and whosoever did so unworthily rendered himself liable to damnation. And then they added that it could be consecrated by any good man, whether clergyman or layman, which doubtless referred to their doctrine of the daily love-feast, before explained by us. They would answer no further questions, on the ground that they would not be forced to give an account of their faith. Concerning marriage, which they certainly condemned, they gave an ambiguous explanation. When asked what they thought of penance and confession, they answered "For the sick, it was enough if they confessed their sins when they pleased to do so. As to the duty of those in health they had nothing further to say, since James spoke only of the sick." To the question whether in addition to contrition of heart, and oral confession, a church satisfaction was also required, they answered, James speaks only of confession; nor did they wish to be better than the apostles and add something of their own, as the bishops did. When upon this, the condemning sentence was passed upon them, and their doctrines, by the bishops, they turned to the assembled multitude and said: "Listen, ye good people, to our faith which we confess. But we confess propter dilectionem et gratiam vestri." Which to be sure was ambiguous, as if they expressed themselves as they did, only to avoid giving offence to the multitude, who were incapable of understanding the pure truth. Which ambiguity was perhaps remarked by a bishop, who therefore objected to them: "Vos non dicitis, quod propter gratiam Domini dicatis atque dicitis propter gratiam populi," and they then recited a confession in perfect accordance with the orthodox faith, and which contained many things, therefore, which they could not honorably say.

that they either utterly refused to confirm any statement by an oath, or else endeavored to appease their consciences by pretending that they did not swear from their souls, but only mechanically repeated a form of words after the dictation of another person.[1] When, at the council of Lombez, the Catharists had laid down a confession for the multitude altogether consonant with orthodoxy, and they were required to confirm it by oath, they declared they would not swear in any case, because it was contrary to the gospels, and to the writings of the apostles. We have already observed how easily any man who, from conscientious regard to the words of Christ, declined taking an oath, might fall under the suspicion of being a Catharist. As it was now thought that no confidence could be placed in their assertions, and as judgments of God, notwithstanding that influential voices had pronounced against them,[2] had not, down to the thirteenth century, been forbidden by any general law of the church,[3] — resort was had, in such doubtful cases, to judgments of God, as a means of arriving at certainty respecting the guilt or innocence of suspected persons.[4] Thus individuals who, on no sufficient grounds, had incurred the suspicion of heresy might, by the uncertain decision of such a judgment of God be made to suffer, although innocent. The excellent Peter Cantor, that warm opponent of judgments of God, as an institution directly at variance with the spirit of Christianity and of the church,[5] vigorously attacks the arbitrary will and tyranny over conscience which characterized the proceedings against the Catharists: "The pagans," says he, "used to grant a Christian who would not give in, or who had not himself confessed, a respite of thirty days to decide whether he would or would not offer to the idols. But from him who was convinced, or who confessed, and then denied the name of Christ, it was only required that he should offer to the gods. Whether he did so from the heart was not made a matter of examination. Why does the church now presume to search men's hearts, by a judgment out of her province? Or why should not the legal respite be granted to the Catharists? Why are they burnt at once?" He states that honorable matrons, who would not abandon themselves to the pleasures of their priests, had been accused by them as Catharists, and condemned by a powerful lord, whom he describes as a weak zealot for the faith; while from rich Catharists they were satisfied with extorting money.[6] Yet sometimes human sympathy would triumph over fanati-

[1] As Rainer says, t. xxv, c. ix, f. 274: Ut formet sibi conscientiam, quod non sit jurans, sed tantum recitator juramenti judicis.

[2] Yves of Chartres opposed them, because he looked upon them as a mode of tempting God, and as forbidden by the church laws. Ep. 74 and 205.

[3] First, the Lateran council of the year 1215 forbade the clergy at least from taking any part in judgments of God, and severed them from all connection with the church: Nec qui quam purgationi aquae ferventis vel frigidae seu ferri candentis ritum cujuslibet benedictionis aut consecrationis impendat.

[4] The judicium aquae frigidae in the above-mentioned case in Guibert Novi gentens. De vita sua, lib. iii, c. xvi.

[5] See Verbum Abbreviatum, p. 200.

[6] Loculis divitum Catharorum emunctis et abire permissorum. The same person cites the example of a female recluse who had fallen into bad repute with the people by familiar intercourse with the Catharists, so that none were willing to bring her food

cism, and the Catharists found comfort from many who accused the church of cruelty.[1]

The Catharists could show conclusively that persecuting false teachers was directly contrary to the essence of Christianity. They referred, for example, to the parable of the wheat and the tares, to show that man should not forestall the divine judgment, and anticipate the divine process of separation, by a violent interference of human will.[2] William of Paris, who speaks of this as a doctrine sprung up in his own times from the pit of hell, and contrary to divine law and divine justice,[3] says against it, "Certainly it was not Christ's intention that the tares should be spared, but only the wheat. He could not mean, that the tares should be spared at the expense of the wheat, or that they should be spared, when they could not be without injury to the wheat. Wherever, then, the ungodly increase to the injury of God's people, they must be extirpated; and that by death, if it cannot be effected otherwise. Now it is true that they who, at present, belong to the tares, may be converted into wheat; but this is a matter of uncertainty. But that by their means the wheat is turned into tares, is a matter of perfect certainty; for the simple and ignorant are led astray with incredible facility by the sly craft of the heretics. A few tares may easily choke a large field of wheat. It is a very rare and a very difficult thing to convert a heretic; but it is a very easy and common thing to subvert the faithful."[4]

The intrepidity and calmness with which Catharists faced an excruciating death, might well create an impression in their favor, on those who were not altogether hardened by fanaticism. Their enemies had no other way of accounting for it, but by ascribing it to the power of Satan. A bishop of the Catharists, named Arnold, marched firmly, with several of his believers, to the stake, simply asking that he might first have a morsel of bread and a basin of water, doubtless for the purpose of distributing the holy supper according to their own mode. When the fire seized them, he laid his hands on them, in the midst of the flames, and said, "Be of good comfort, my brethren; to-day we shall be with St. Lawrence." A comely maiden, who had been condemned to die with them, exciting compassion, was pulled from the flames. She was promised that if she would renounce the sect, she should either be sent to a monastery or provided with a husband. She seemed at first to consent; but when Arnold was now dead, she asked, "Where lies the seducer?" and, pressing her hands to her face, she threw herself upon the body, and died in the flames.[5]

By the advice of her confessor, to whom she protested her innocence, she resolved to subject herself to the ordeal of the hot iron; but it turned out twice to her disadvantage. Verbum Abbreviatum, p. 200.

[1] Thus Humbert de Romanis, in his Rules for the preachers of his order, thinks some regard should be had to such impressions and objections (ii, 62, f. 555, l. c.): Sunt multi, qui quadam falsa pietate moventur circa illos et judicant ecclesiam de nimia credulitate.

[2] See Moneta, lib. v, c. xiii, f. 519.

[3] De legibus, c. i, f. 26.

[4] Difficilem admodum et raram videmus haereticorum conversionem, facillimam autem et crebram fidelium subversionem.

[5] See Caesar. Heisterbac. Dist. v, c. xix. f. 138.

The persecutions furthered the spread of the Catharists, who often held their meetings in obscure retreats, catacombs, and subterranean caves.[1] During the quarrel of pope Gregory the Ninth with the emperor Frederic the Second, and the absence of the former from Rome, the Catharists were enabled to spread their opinions, not only among laymen, but also the clergy; so that, as was ascertained by inquiries set on foot in 1231, many priests even were infected with the heresy, and the sharpest measures had to be employed in order to stay it. Whoever had any knowledge of the existence of heretics, in any place, or of their secret meetings, and did not give notice of it, should be excommunicated. Every layman was strictly forbidden, on penalty of the ban, to dispute publicly or privately on the faith.[2] Such was their boldness that, in open defiance of the church, they proceeded to elect a pope for themselves, to act as supreme head over their scattered communities. Such a pope appears in South France, Nequinta. He held, in 1167, a church-assembly at Toulouse, to which crowds of men and women flocked, to receive from their pope the consolamentum. Many bishops of the party came there also with their clergy.[3] Nine bishops were installed, and received ordination from the pope by the consolamentum.[4] As disputes existed among the bishops respecting the boundaries of their dioceses, a committee was appointed for the purpose of determining these boundaries.[5] Still later, about A. D. 1223, the sect chose themselves a pope in their original seat, in Bulgaria. His name was Bartholomew; and he imitated, in all respects, the pope of Rome. Delegates of the sect visited him from all quarters, for the purpose of consulting him on disputed matters. He began his epistles as follows: *Bartholomaeus, servus servorum, sanctae fidei N. N. salutem.* By invitation from a bishop of the sect, whom he had appointed his vicar, in Carcassone, he made a villa in that district his residence.[6]

Among the sects of oriental origin belongs, perhaps, besides those already mentioned, the Pasagii, or Pasagini. It is manifest, from the agreement of the two accounts respecting this sect, which appeared in Italy towards and after the close of the twelfth century,[7] that it sprung out of a mixture of Judaism and Christianity. To the confession of Christ they united the literal observance of the Mosaic law, except sacrifices, which ceased of course after the destruction of the temple. They revived, also, subordinationism in the doctrine of the Trinity. Christ they regarded only as first among the creatures of God, probably the one by whose instrumentality he formed all other creatures. We may now ask, to what source shall we look for the origin of this mix-

[1] L. c. Dist. v, c. xxii, f. 142.

[2] Raynaldi Annales, an. 1231. N. 13, etc.

[3] Episcopi cum consilio suo, as is said.

[4] Accordingly, it is said of such an one: Accepit consolamentum et ordinem episcopi, ut esset episcopus ecclesiae Tholosanae.

[5] Divisores ecclesiarum. The acts of this council, in the Histoire des Ducs, Marquis et Comte de Narbonne, par le Sieur Besse. Paris, 1660, p. 483.

[6] Matthew of Paris, at the year 1223, in the above-cited edition, f. 267, mentions, as a document in evidence of what is here said, a letter of the papal legate to the archbishop of Rouen.

[7] Of Bonacursus: De vita haereticorum in the Spicileg. of D'Achery, t. i, f. 212, and of a G. of Bergamo, in Muratori antiq Ital. medii aevi, t. v, f. 151.

ture ?[1] "As multitudes of Jews were scattered in all directions, and these, though oppressed and persecuted in various ways, yet oftentimes arose by means of their wealth to great influence, creating friends by their money among the great and mighty by whom they were protected, and as we may elsewhere observe many indications of an influence exerted by Jews upon the convictions of those Christians with whom they frequently associated,[2] it is not inconceivable, that some such influence of habitual intercourse with Jews, may have given rise to a sect blending Judaism with Christianity, and which may thus have had a purely domestic origin in the West itself. Lucas, bishop of Tuy, looked upon it as an adroit contrivance of the heretics, that they submitted to circumcision, pretended to be Jews, under this mask promulgated their opinions, and so easily found protection and a hearing from the patrons and friends of the Jews.[3] But what can be more improbable than that men who were not themselves Jews, especially that Catharists, the class of heretics evidently here meant, those enemies of Judaism, should subject themselves to that detested rite of circumcision, instituted, according to their opinion, by the evil principle ; should pretend to be Jews, in order to secure such outward objects, for the securing of which this was by no means the best course ; for if on the one hand they might, under this mask, more easily find protection and a hearing from some, yet on the other hand they would disgust still greater numbers, over whom, by other means, they might have succeeded in exerting an influence. The matter of fact, which must be separated from the subjective reflections of the reporter, we should be inclined to regard as simply this : that there was an heretical tendency, leaning to the side of Judaism ; which leaning, however, was wrongly supposed to be hypocritically put on for the purpose of compassing certain ends. The name of this sect reminds one of the word *pasagium* (passage), which signifies a tour, and was very commonly employed to denote pilgrimages to the East, to the holy sepulchre, — crusades. May not this word, then, be regarded as an index, pointing to the origin of the sect as one that came from the East, intimating that it grew out of the intercourse with Palestine ? May we not suppose that from very ancient times a party of Judaizing Christians had survived, of which this sect must be regarded as an offshoot ? The way in which they expressed themselves concerning Christ as being the firstborn of creation, would point also, more directly, at

[1] Over which Lucas Tudensis laments, lib. iii, c. iii : Audiunt sæculi principes et judices urbium doctrinam hæresium a Judæis, quos familiares sibi annumerant et amicos. Si aliquis, ductus zelo legis Dei, aliquem horum exasperavit, punitur quasi qui tangit pupillam oculi judicis civitatis.

[2] See the above-cited examples, where we were speaking of the abbot Guibert ; and see the bull of pope Nicholas the Third, of the year 1288, in which he alleges, not only that many Jews who had embraced Christianity had turned back again to Judaism, which admits of being easily explained from the kind of conversions, verum etiam quam plurimi Christiani, veritatem catholicæ fidei abnegantes, se damnabiliter ad Judaïcum ritum transtulerunt.

[3] Hæretici quadam excogitata malitia plerumque circumciduntur et sub specie Judæorum quasi gratia disputandi ad Christianos veniunt et hæreticas quæstiones proponunt. Liberius tanquam Judæi hæreses seminant, qui primo verbum hæresis dicere non audebant. Lib. iii, c. iii.

the connection of their doctrine with some older Jewish theology, than at that later purely Western origin.

The impulse given by oriental Dualism had contributed, it is true, in a great measure, to call forth a reaction of the Christian consciousness, longing after liberty, against the churchly theocratic system; yet this was not the only cause by which such appearances were produced. That secularization of the church, that confusion of Jewish and Christian elements in its forms and doctrines, could not fail, of itself, to arouse the opposition of a Christian consciousness, repelling this foreign matter; an opposition which was not to be kept under by any force, but which must continually break forth with increasing strength, till, with the fulness of time, it reached its triumph in the Reformation. As the progressive development of the church, proceeding on the foundation of faith in Christ as the only Saviour, pressed onwards to the Reformation, many kindred appearances would precede it. Those sects of oriental origin were but transient appearances, leaving behind them no after-effects of their own particular form. What continued to operate longer than themselves, was the opposition they set at work; which, however, cast aside the oriental and Dualistic element, and started on other principles. Of the Catharists, we afterwards meet with no further traces; but that reaction of the Christian consciousness, of which we spoke, was continually exhibiting itself in other forms, till it obtained a more durable shape in the sect of the Waldenses. Various influences coöperated to produce such reactions. We saw how the reforming bent of the Hildebrandian epoch invited the laity to rise against a corrupt clergy. The pope himself took the lead in a movement of popular reform. And we saw how, after the first impulse had been given, it might lead farther than was intended. The name *Patarenes*, which, signifying in the first place a union of the people against the corrupt clergy, passed over into an appellation of the Catharists, may serve as an illustration. Thus arose separatist tendencies. The laity would have nothing to do with the corrupt clergy. Such people, they thought, were unfitted to perform any sacramental act. From these beginnings it was easy to proceed further, to declare the sacraments of the corrupt church, generally, null and void. In laymen, would be awakened the consciousness of the universal priesthood, and they would soon consider themselves capable of administering the sacraments to one another.[1] There needed but a man of some power over the minds of others, and of an enterprising spirit, to furnish a centre for the revolutionary movement, and, by the intermingling of savage passion and fanaticism, the most violent scenes might have been witnessed. Thus that wild demagogue Tanchelm, of whom to be sure we know nothing except from the reports of embittered opponents,[2] placed him-

[1] Thus bishop Yves of Chartres must maintain the necessary recognition of a special priesthood against such as supposed quascunque personas, etiam sacrum ordinem non habentes, verba dominica proferentes, sacramenta altaris et cætera ecclesiastica sacramenta posse conficere et salubriter accipientibus ministrare. Ep. 63 Ed. Paris, 1610.

[2] See Norbert's life, c. xiii, Jun. t. i, f. 843, and the letter of the church of Utrecht to the bishop Frederic of Cologne, first published by Sebastian Tengnagel, Cologne, f. 845. What gave him acceptance in Ant-

self at the head of a separatistic popular movement of this kind in Flanders. As he undertook to visit Rome, we may certainly infer that he was not following out any wholly anti-churchly direction, but was hoping, in consideration of his zeal against the unchaste clergy, to find some support in the Hildebrandian system at Rome. In addition to all this, came the ideas put into circulation by the disputes about investiture, those ideas which, in opposition to the earthly glory of the church, favored the copying after the apostolical life in evangelical poverty, which sometimes allied themselves with existing customs in various forms of the monastic life, sometimes rose in resistance to the church herself. Thus we find in many districts, indications of societies of the so-called apostolicals, who were for bringing back the apostolical simplicity of the church, and whom we must take care to distinguish from the Catharists, with which sect, owing to many points of resemblance, they might easily be confounded.

When the provost Everwin of Steinfeld drew up his report to abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, of the sects in the territory of Cologne, he expressly distinguished from the Catharists another party, which probably, although agreeing with them in opposing the Catholic church, yet differed from them by their more biblical tendency, by combating Dualism, Gnosticism, etc., and it was just the disputes between these two anti-church parties which had drawn upon them the attention of their common opponent.[1] The worldly and corrupt church, they taught, had lost the power of administering the sacraments; the successors of Peter had forfeited their title to the spiritual authority conferred upon them, because they had not followed him in a life consecrated to God. Baptism in the church was the only rite they would still acknowledge, and they acknowledged this because, whoever might administer the rite, it was still Christ that baptized. As then they did not substitute the consolamentum in the place of baptism, they were by this circumstance alone sufficiently distinguished from the Catharists. Yet infant baptism they opposed as a non-apostolic institution. So too they were very far from rejecting, with the Catharists, the institution of marriage, which they recognized as a holy estate instituted by God. But they reckoned it to the sacredness of marriage that it should only be contracted between parties who had never been married before, as being an indissoluble connection. What God had joined together, no man should put asunder. They rejected the intercession of saints, denied the necessity of fasting and of ecclesiastical satisfactions for sins. Neither the sinner nor the righteous man needed it; for if the sinner did but sigh after God, his sins would be forgiven him. They would recognize no ordinance but such as had proceeded

werp was the bad management of the church; for it is stated, in the above life, that the whole large diocese was governed by a priest, who gave himself but little concern about the flock, and was scorned by the people on account of his unlawful intercourse with his niece.

[1] Everwin, after having described the Catharists, says: Sunt item alii haeretici quidam in terra nostra, omnino ab istis discordantes, per quorum mutuam discordiam et contentionem utrique nobis sunt detecti. Mabillon, Analecta, t. iii, p. 456.

from the institution of Christ and the apostles; all else they declared to be superstition. They combated the doctrine of purgatory, maintaining that when souls departed from this life, their everlasting destiny was already decided; hence they were opposed to all prayers and other works for the repose of departed souls.

Neither do we perceive in another sect which made its appearance about this time in the department of Perigueux,[1] in South France, the least signs of any peculiarity of the Catharists; though we see other peculiarities still more fanatical. They were for following the apostles in a total renunciation of all earthly goods. They abstained from meat, and drank very little wine. Opposition to the mass, which was common to all the anti-churchly tendencies, seems to have been carried by them to the extreme of rejecting the Lord's supper altogether. They combated all veneration of the cross and of the images of Christ as idolatry. The frequent bowing of the knee, a custom which we find ascribed to them, would not warrant the inference that they were a branch of the Catharists, but should be regarded, probably, as simply a mark of the Pietistic element. One of their doxologies is cited, which shows that, contrary to the Dualism of the Catharists, they acknowledged God as the creator of all things. As they adopted that idea of evangelical poverty which was grounded in the religious spirit of the times, as much truth lay at the bottom of their attacks on the dominant church, and as they often appealed to Scripture, they might find acceptance with many; and it is reported that not only people of rank left their possessions and joined them, but also clergymen, priests, monks, and nuns, were among their adherents.[2] And it is mentioned as a characteristic fact, that the rudest and most unlettered peasant who joined their sect, would in less than eight days gain so much knowledge of the Scriptures, that he could not be foiled in argument by any man. They were accused of practising necromancy.

Sometimes such tendencies proceeded from the midst of the people, without being connected with any individual of note. Although some individual may have given the first impulse, yet afterwards he retired into the general mass. Sometimes it was individuals who constituted from the beginning the central point of such a reformatory movement. While some stood forth, who had been awakened within the body of the clergy, and, seized with indignation at the depraved members of their order, felt themselves impelled to travel about as preachers of repentance in the sense of the church, there were others, in whose case the awakening seems rather to have proceeded from the spirit which breathed on them from the Bible than from the general spirit of the church, and whose labors as reformatory preachers of repentance were chiefly guided and determined by that circumstance. These latter were not only zealous against practical corruptions, but, as they had been led by their study of the Bible to perceive an element foreign to Bible Christianity in the church as it then was, many things false in

[1] Petragorium. [2] See the report of the monk Heribert, in Mabillon, l. c. p. 467.

its doctrines and its rites, felt themselves impelled to attack the corrupt church herself on this particular side, and to stand forth not barely as reformers of life, but also of doctrine. Frequently, however, the prudence of such men did not come up to the measure of their zeal. In combating one error, they often fell into the opposite extreme, and in what they attacked as false, they had no skill to discern the particle of truth at the bottom. They went too far on the side of negation; and to their polemics against the unauthenticated mysteries of church doctrine, a one-sided negative and subjective tendency might easily attach itself.

One of the first among these reformers was the priest Peter of Bruis, who appeared, near the close of the twelfth or in the beginning of the thirteenth century, in South France.[1] It is certain that he rejected the authority of the church and of the great teachers, to whom it was customary to appeal, and would recognize nothing as obligatory on faith, but what could be proved from the Bible. But it may be questioned, whether he attributed this authority to the whole Bible; whether he did not make a difference between the Old and New Testament; whether he attributed equal authority even to the entire New Testament; whether he did not make a difference in this respect between the gospels and the epistles; whether he ascribed an altogether decisive force to anything except that which Christ had taught with his own words. The last is repeatedly laid to his charge; and if he refused to acknowledge the celebration of the Holy supper as valid for all times of the church, and denied the significance of the redemptive sufferings of Christ, the charge might seem to be well grounded. The biblical Protestant element would in this case have passed over into a rationalistic, critical one. Still, what is said on this point is too uncertain and fluctuating to afford any ground for a safe conclusion; and so the venerable abbot Peter of Cluny, with a reservation of judgment which does him honor, declines expressing any opinion here, lest he might bring a false charge upon the man after his death.[2] He was an opponent of infant baptism, since he regarded personal faith as a necessary condition for true baptism, and denied the benefit in this case of another's faith. As he could not allow, according to this, any validity whatever to infant baptism, he must consequently rebaptize, or bestow true baptism for the first time on those who joined his party. The followers of Peter of Bruis refused to be called Anabaptists, a name given to them for the reason just mentioned: because the only baptism, they said, which they could regard as the true one, was a

[1] We can very nearly calculate the time, if we put together the two facts, that he labored during a period of twenty years, and that Abelard, in his Introduction to Theology, written before the year 1121, speaks of him as a person deceased. See Opp. p. 1066.

[2] The words are in his letter in refutation of the Petrobrusians: Videndum est, utrum hi, qui tantis orbis terrarum magistris non credunt, saltem Christo, prophetis vel apostolis adquiescant. Hoc ideo dico, quoniam nec ipsi Christo vel prophetis aut apostolis ipsique majestati veteris ac novi testamenti vos ex toto credere fama vulgavit. Sed quia fallaci rumorum monstro non facile assensum praebere debeo, maxime cum quidam vos totum divinum canonem abjecisse affirment, alii quaedam ex ipso vos suscepisse contendant, culpare vos de incertis nolo.

baptism united with knowledge and faith, by which man is cleansed from his sins.[1] The mass, the pretension of the priests that they could produce Christ's body and repeat his sacrifice, Peter of Bruis looked upon as the grand means for upholding and promoting the dominion of the priesthood; this doctrine, therefore, he vehemently attacked. But this vehemence carried him so far that he was willing to dispense with the celebration of the eucharist altogether. Language like this, was spoken, if not by himself, at least by one of his adherents: "O ye people, do not believe those false guides, the bishops and priests; for they deceive you: as in so many other things, so also in the service of the altar, when they falsely pretend that they make the body of Christ, and present it to you for the salvation of your souls. They pronounce an absolute falsehood; for the body of Christ was made but once by Christ himself before his passion at the last supper, and was given but once, at that time, to his disciples." It is difficult to understand exactly what is meant by this language. The simplest view would be to suppose that he meant to say, Christ had observed this supper but once, as a parting meal, and it was not to be repeated at all. But if we hold closely to the words, they actually express that Christ did then distribute his body to his disciples in the proper sense. We must in this case suppose that Peter of Bruis believed it necessary to follow here the literal meaning of the words, in which this fact seemed to him to be expressed, and was satisfied, if he only needed not concede to the church, that she still continued to exercise this power of producing the body of Christ; yet it may be questioned, whether these words really present the exact opinion of the man. His zeal against the veneration paid to the cross, led him to say, that the instrument with which Christ was so cruelly put to death, was so far from deserving reverence that it should rather be abused and destroyed in every way to avenge his sufferings and death. To what outbreaks of rude passion, doing outrage to the religious feelings of others, a negative fanaticism of this sort was capable of leading men, is illustrated by a remarkable example. On one Good-Friday, the Petrobrusians got together a great multitude of people, collected all the crosses which they could lay hold of, and made a large bonfire of them, at which, in contempt of the church laws, they cooked meat, which was distributed to all present. It may be doubted, accordingly, whether Peter of Bruis recognized the significance which Christ's redemptive sufferings possess for the Christian consciousness; whether the very fact that this was a thing so foreign to his mind sufficiently accounts for the violence of his language, or whether the heat of polemical opposition may not have led him to say what he would not have said in a calmer mood of mind. His zeal against the externalizing spirit of the dominant church prevented him from allowing that respect which is due to the necessary connection between the internal

[1] Nos vero, said they, tempus congruum fidei expectamus, et hominem, postquam Deum suum agnoscere et in eum credere paratus est, non, ut nobis imponitis, rebaptizamus, sed baptizamus, quia nunquam baptizatus dicendus est, qui baptismo, quo peccata lavantur, lotus non est.

and the external in man's religious nature. He required the destruction of churches especially consecrated to the worship of God. "God may be worshipped just as well in the shop and on the market-place, as in the church. God hears wherever he is called upon, and listens to the worthy suppliant, whether he prays before an altar or in a stall." On the same principle, church psalmody was rejected. "God is mocked by such service; he to whom pious feeling is alone acceptable, is neither brought near by loud vociferation nor soothed by musical melodies." He rejected prayer, offerings, alms for the departed, maintaining "that all depends on a man's conduct during his life on earth; this decides his destiny. Nothing that is done for him after he is dead can be of any use to him." For twenty years, Peter of Bruis had labored as a preacher in South France, when seized by an infuriated mob at St. Gilles, in Languedoc, he was hurried away to the stake. But as his doctrines still continued after his death to have an influence in many districts, particularly around Gascoigne, — a fact which the venerable abbot Peter was forced to learn while on a tour in those parts, — the latter composed a book in refutation of them, which he sent to the bishops of the region, inviting them at the same time to use their personal influence in suppressing the heresy. "It was their business," he wrote them, "by preaching, to drive the sect from those spots where they flattered themselves they had found a hiding-place, and, if necessary, to call in to their aid the weapons of the laity. But as it became Christian charity to labor more for their conversion than for their extirpation, authorities should be brought before them, and arguments of reason employed, so as to force these people, if they avowed themselves Christians, to bow to authority, and, if they wished to be considered men, to bow to reason."[1]

When Peter the Venerable deemed it necessary to call upon the bishops of South France to suppress the Petrobrusians, another man had already started up, as Peter himself testifies, who agreed, if not in every particular doctrine, yet in his reformatory bent, with Peter of Bruis; an individual by whose means the anti-church tendency which had proceeded from the latter was revived after his death, and received a new impulse. Henry, a monk of Cluny, and a deacon, came from Switzerland. Whether it was by an impulse of his own, that, disgusted with the common pursuits of the world, and touched with higher aspirations, he retired to the monastery, or whether he was presented to it by his parents in his infancy, is not known. But certain it is that the quiet of the contemplative life did not satisfy this ardent young man. He felt himself impelled to seek a life of practical activity. He had derived his knowledge of the truths of faith from the New Testament more than from the writings of the fathers and of the theologians of his time. The ideal of the apostolic labors stimulated him to imitation. His heart was inflamed with a glowing zeal

[1] Ut, si Christiani permanere volunt, auctoritati, si homines, rationi cedere compellantur.

of charity to look after the religious needs of the people, either totally neglected or else led astray by a worthless clergy. As a preacher of repentance he sallied forth, which at that time was no unusual thing, in the dress of a monk, and barefoot. According to the custom of such itinerant preachers of repentance, he took up his residence in the houses of the citizens or countrymen to whom he preached, and was contented with any fare that was set before him.[1] So far as we know, he first appeared as a preacher of repentance in the city of Lausanne.[2] From thence he betook himself to France. Persons like-minded joined him; and an apostolical society was formed under his direction. His companions went before him, bearing, as a symbol of the preacher of repentance, the banner of the cross, inviting men to follow the cross of Christ, — a fact which plainly shows, that, in his estimation of this sacred emblem, he was far from agreeing with Peter of Bruis. At first, he only preached repentance, denouncing that sham Christianity which did not prove its genuineness by the fruits of good living, and warning against the prevalent vices. This led him next to warn men against their false guides, the worthless clergy, whose example and teaching did more to promote wickedness than to put a stop to it. He contrasted the clergy as they actually were with what they ought to be; he attacked their vices, particularly their unchastity. He was a zealot for the observance of the laws of celibacy, and appeared in this respect, like other monks, a promoter of the Hildebrandian reformation. It was probably his practical, restless activity, and the opposition which he met with on the part of the higher clergy, which led him to proceed further, and, as he traced the cause of the corruption to a deviation from the primitive apostolical teaching, to attack errors in doctrine. He must have possessed extraordinary power as a speaker, and this power was backed up by his strict mode of living. Many men and women were awakened by him to repentance, brought to confess their sins, and to renounce them. It was said, a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching. The people were struck under such conviction by his sermons, which seemed to lay open to them their inmost hearts, that they attributed to him a sort of prophetic gift, by virtue of which he could look into the very souls of men.

On Ash-Wednesday of the year 1116, two of Henry's spiritual society arrived with the banner of the cross at the city of Mans; they came to inquire whether their master might visit the city as a preacher of repentance during the season of Lent. The people who had already

[1] What Bernard (ep. 241) says to his disadvantage, bears no impress whatever of a report founded on facts, but seems much rather like the false conclusions of a polemical sophistry set forth as facts, which might be sustained perhaps by false rumors easily set afloat against one stigmatized as a heretic. Owing to the disgrace in which he had involved himself by his wicked life, being forced to leave his native country, he wandered about without a home. To obtain a livelihood, being a *literatus*, he resorted to preaching, and made a trade of it. What he could obtain more than was necessary for his own support from the simple-minded, he squandered away in gambling, or things still worse. The only reliable fact out of all this is what has been stated in the text.

[2] See the above-cited report of Bernard.

heard so much of him, were now anxiously expecting the time when he would make his personal appearance. The bishop of the city at that time, Hildebert, a pupil of Berengar of Tours, one of the more discreet and pious bishops, received the two messengers in a very friendly manner, and as Henry was not known as yet to be guilty of any heresy, as only his mighty influence on the people was everywhere extolled, the bishop rejoiced at the opportunity of securing a preacher like him for his people during the Lent. And being then about to start on a journey to Rome, he gave directions to his archdeacon that he should allow Henry to preach without molestation. The latter soon won the same great influence here as he had done everywhere else. Among the clergy themselves there was a division. The higher clergy were prejudiced against him on account of his method of proceeding; the younger clergy of the lower class, who were less tied to the church system, and had nothing to fear from Henry's invectives, could not resist the impression of his discourses, and the seed of the doctrines which he scattered among them, continued to spring up for a long time after him. They became his adherents, and prepared a stage for him, on which he could be heard by the entire people. One effect of his preaching soon began to manifest itself. He chained the people to himself, and filled them with contempt and hatred towards the higher clergy. They would have nothing to do with them. The divine service celebrated by them was no longer attended. They found themselves exposed to the insults and gibes of the populace, and had to apply for protection to the civil arm. Though it scarcely admits of a doubt that if Henry, had he known better how to curb his passions, might with a little foresight and wisdom have easily prevented these effects; yet we must own that, as we have only a report of the facts on one side, from an individual belonging to the clerical party, and a passionate opponent of Henry,[1] it is impossible to decide how much the preacher was to blame, and how far the fault lay also on the side of his opponents. Suffice it to say, that the clerus of the city, by virtue of the full powers residing in them, issued a letter to Henry, upbraiding him for his abuse of the confidence reposed in him, and for his ingratitude, and accusing him as the author of the division between the clergy and the community, an instigator of sedition and propagator of heresies. On penalty of the ban on himself and all his adherents, he was forbidden to preach in any part of the diocese. Henry refused to receive the letter when offered to him, not recognizing the tribunal which had passed the judgment. A clergyman read the letter publicly before all, and at each several sentence, Henry shook his head and exclaimed, "Thou liest." Probably he did not find the reasons sufficient to sustain the several charges brought against him. The definitive sentence issued against him by the clerus, served, however, to promote rather than to diminish his influence with the multitude; the clergy had far more cause to be afraid of him, than he

[1] The Gesta Hildeberti in the Actis episcoporum Cenomanensium, published in Mabillon, Analecta, vet. t. iii, p. 312, octavo edition.

to be afraid of them. With the people he was everything; they were ready to be directed and determined in all their movements by him; and among those who followed him as their spiritual guide in all things, seem to have belonged not only the people of the lower class, but also substantial citizens; for any amount of gold and silver was at his command; and had he been governed by impure motives he might easily have made himself rich. But the only use he made of the money which was at his disposal, was to realize his ideas of a Christian commonwealth.[1] If we are surprised to see Henry ruling over the whole life of the people, and shaping their domestic and civil relations according to his own ideas, we must consider the immense influence of the theocratic principle in those times, and remember that what the popes were on the large scale, such were those who in still smaller circles appeared as the oracles of God, namely, powerful preachers of repentance, and curers of souls. Now, in this light, it was quite possible for such also to be regarded, as stood forth as opponents of the churchly theocratical system. We see Henry deporting himself like other men who have already been mentioned, — Robert of Arbrissel, Fulco, Berthold; save that his principles are peculiar to himself. In common with them, too, he labored particularly against the sin of unchastity, and sought to improve the marriage relation. Women who led an unchaste life should, as a penance for themselves and a terror to others, be exposed to the disgrace of having their clothes and their hair publicly burnt before the eyes of all. They must bind themselves under oath to renounce unchastity and extravagance in dress. The life of celibacy, he regarded as a custom which promoted immorality among the laity; he took pains, on the contrary, to encourage marriages between young men and maidens. Marriage was to be an indissoluble connection formed by God, through the inner fellowship of dispositions; selfishness should have no hand in forming such unions for a whole life. There should be no bargaining in marriage. The fact that a man chose his wife for the sake of some outward advantages, he regarded as the cause of nearly all unhappy marriages. This practice he wished utterly to abolish; and proposed that no money or goods should be obtained by marriage.[2] Wherever he supposed God had drawn souls together, he did not allow himself to be deterred by any of the hindrances defined by the laws of the church from sanctioning their union, which was so construed by his enemies as if he was ready to approve of any sort of incest.[3] It seems that, on the principle of removing every cause of arbitrary

[1] The words of a party-report can establish nothing against the purity of Henry's course of proceeding; for one cannot but feel that its author was reluctant to say anything good of him, and could not forbear suspecting his good qualities and charging him with bad ones, though they were rather taken for granted than proved. Tanta auri, tanta argenti affluentia, si vellet, redundaret, ut opes omnium solus videretur possidere. Licet plane multa reciperet, tamen parcebat cupiditati, ne nimis ambitiosus videretur.

[2] The words of that report are: Nec quilibet amplius aurum, argentum, possessiones, sponsalia cum uxore sumeret, nec illi dotem conferret.

[3] Thus in the report, the doctrine is attributed to him: Nec curarent, sive caste seu inceste connubium sortirentur.

distinctions among men, he got free-born young men to take wives from the class of bond-women, and then used the money placed at his command to provide the latter with decent raiment.[1] Henry's virulent antagonist, from whom we have the account of his labors in Mans, brings up against him the unhappy issue of the marriages which were formed by his arrangement. This certainly would be an argument to show his want of a knowledge of mankind, or his want of wisdom and prudence, but no argument against the purity of his motives. As with a view to promote practical Christianity, Henry attacked every opinion which might serve to nourish a false confidence, so he seems to have been led by this interest to attack various customs, which could not be directly proved from the Sacred Scriptures as corruptions of primitive Christianity; such, for example, as the worship of saints and infant baptism.[2] But it may be doubted whether at this particular time he had as yet so distinctly evolved the points of his opposition to the doctrines of the church. Though even then he was accused of error in doctrine, yet heresies of so striking a character were not expressly alleged against him. But we must allow that the tendency which would inevitably lead him to such results may be clearly discerned in what his opponents say of him; for they charge that he held only to the historical sense and letter of the prophets, and therefore set up a perverse doctrine.[3] From which language it may be inferred, that he acknowledged no doctrine which could not be expressly pointed out, as contained in so many words in the Bible; that he was an opponent of all allegorizing interpretation.

When Hildebert returned from his journey to Rome, he found the tone of feeling in his community strangely altered. He was no longer received with the usual demonstrations of joy, and the usual veneration. His episcopal blessing was treated with contempt. Henry was everything to the people. "We have a father," exclaimed the people, "a priest, an intercessor, still more exalted in authority, more honorable in life, more eminent in knowledge. The clergy abhor him as a godless man, because they are afraid he will attack with the weapons of the Sacred Scriptures their vices, their incontinence, and their false doctrines."[4] By an imperious, violent mode of procedure, bishop Hildebert would only have increased Henry's influence, and alienated the popular feeling still more from himself. By wisdom and love, gentleness and forbearance, he could effect more. Henry himself he was determined not to put down by force. He had an interview with him, which, as we might presume, would not be a satisfactory one. In the theology and liturgy of the church, Henry could exhibit but

[1] Ejus admonitu multi juvenum ducebant venales mulieres, quibus ipse pannos pretio quatuor solidorum emebat. quo nuditatem suam tantummodo supertegerent.

[2] Vide Bernhard, ep. 241, and Hildebert, ep. 23.

[3] Aurem suam tantum historiae et literae prophetarum accommodans dogmatizabat perversum dogma. Acta Cenomanens. p. 341.

[4] Verentes, quod eorum scelera denudaret prophetico spiritu, et haeresim suam et corporis incontinentiam privilegio condemnaret literarum. These words are of some importance as indicating the character of Henry's labors in Mans. We see from them that he was zealous for strict celibacy in priests: attacked first their life, then their doctrine; held up against them the doctrines of the Bible

little proficiency; in the knowledge of the New Testament he might perhaps have sustained a better examination.[1] Bishop Hildebert simply directed Henry to leave his diocese and betake himself to some other field. Would the bishop have pursued so gentle a course with him, if it could have been proved that he was really guilty of the clandestine vices which were whispered against him amongst his enemies? Would not the placing him on his trial for such offences, and suspending over him the punishment affixed to them by the church laws, have been the most direct and certain means of undeceiving the people who reverenced him as a saint? But the mild measures pursued by the bishop towards the clergy who had gone over to Henry, and whom he endeavored to win back from him by degrees, and recover to a more churchlike mode of thinking, may justly claim our respect.[2] In the disputes against saint-worship, which Hildebert was under the necessity of defending, we certainly recognize also, though Henry's name is not mentioned in this connection, a reaction of the ideas which he had disseminated. The opponents of saint-worship appealed to concessions of bishop Hildebert himself. How they could do so may easily be explained, if we call to mind the prevailing bent of the man; for we have already spoken of him as the representative of a more spiritual Christianity, the opponent of a worship of mere ceremonies.[3] We may conjecture that they had in view those declarations of Hildebert in which he protested against certain excrescences of superstition, and exhorted men to copy the living walk of the saints. The genuinely Christian element lying at bottom of the church doctrine and practice in this respect, he knew very well how to insist upon and use against those who denied that the saints had any concern with that which is done on earth."[4] "Without controversy," says he, "love stands preëminent above all the other virtues. On love, hang the law and the prophets: all else must pass away, but charity never ceaseth. Charity is not confined to the measure with which God and our neighbor are loved in this present life; but it becomes more perfect in the life to come, the more perfectly both our neighbor is known in God, and God is known in himself." He refers to this more perfect love existing among the saints, for the purpose of intimating their sympathy in the concerns of their contending brethren on earth.

Henry now turned his face to the South, and made his appearance in Provence. He came into those districts where Peter of Bruis had labored before him. There he put himself at the head of the anti-churchly tendency, which he seems to have shaped into a more systematic doctrinal form.[5] Here he joined himself to a number of

[1] The writer of the report in the Actis Cenomanensibus, represents him as an altogether ignorant man, thus contradicting himself. Hildebert says of him, ep. 24: Huic et habitu religionem et verbis literaturam simulanti. He may have been well versed in the New Testament and yet otherwise unlearned.

[2] See ep. 24.

[3] See above, p. 306.

[4] See ep. 23.

[5] He himself, as Peter of Cluny states, was the author of a tract directed against the church doctrine, in which still more of an heretical character occurred, than in the above-cited propositions of the Petrobru-

like-minded individuals. When Peter of Cluny's letter, mentioned on a former page, had stirred up the zeal of the bishops of that district to contend against the encroaching anti-churchly tendency, the archbishop of Arles succeeded in securing the person of Henry, and took him along with him, in 1134, to the council of Pisa, held under the presidency of pope Innocent the Second. This council declared him a heretic, and condemned him to confinement in a cell.[1] Subsequently, however, he was set at liberty, when he betook himself again to South France, to the districts of Toulouse and Alby, a principal seat of anti-churchly tendencies, where also the great lords who were striving to make themselves independent, favored these tendencies, from hatred to the dominion of the clergy. Among the lower class and the nobles, Henry found great acceptance; and after he had labored for ten years in those regions, Bernard of Clairvaux, in writing to a nobleman, and inviting him to put down the heretics, could say: "The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests, the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are levelled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated."[2] When Bernard says, in the words just quoted, that the communities are without priests, he means the priests had gone over to the Henricians; for so he complains in a sermon,[3] where he speaks of the rapid spread of this sect:[4] "Women forsake their husbands, and husbands their wives, and run over to this sect. Clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches; and they have been found sitting with long beards (to mark the *habitus apostolicus*), among weavers."[5] As this party made such rapid advances, pope Eugene the Third, who was then residing in France, deemed it necessary to resort to other still more energetic measures for its suppression. With this in view, he sent to those districts the cardinal bishop Alberic of Ostia, who took with him the abbot Bernard. If the legate, in all the pomp of his office, was scoffed at, Bernard, on the other hand, whose very appearance refuted the charge that the whole church had become secular, and the clergy and monks sunk in luxury, made quite a different impression, and his great power over the minds of men was manifested also in the present case. Some said he even wrought miracles; and it may be that he appealed to them himself.[6] Probably, however, he did not find it quite so easy to manage

sians. Peter the Venerable says, in the above-cited letter (opp. f. 1119), concerning the relation of Henry to Peter of Bruis: Haeres nequitiae ejus Henricus cum nescio quibus (it seems, then, there were several), doctrinam diabolicam non quidem emendavit, sed immutavit et sicut nuper in tomo, qui ab ore ejus exceptus dicebatur, scriptum vidi, non quinque tantum, sed plura capitula edidit.

[1] Acta Cenomanensia, p. 342.

[2] Ep. 241.

[3] In Cantica Canticorum, Sermo. lxv, § 5.

[4] In these *Sermones*, he does not to be sure treat merely or particularly of the Henricians, but also and especially of the Catharists. The allusion is doubtless to the Henricians, when from those who wholly rejected marriage, he distinguishes those who required marriage between young men and maidens, as a connection which was only once to be formed for the whole life. Sermo. lxvi, § 4.

[5] Clerici et sacerdotes populis ecclesiisque relictis intonsi et barbati quod eos inter textores et textrinas plerumque inventi sunt. Sermo. lxv, § 5.

[6] See above, p. 257.

these sectaries, as his enthusiastic admirers who have given us the account of his life would represent. A writer belonging to these very districts relates that Bernard once came to a strong-hold, constituting one of the principal seats of the sect, and commenced preaching against it, when the leaders of the sect left the church, and were followed by the whole congregation. Bernard hurried after them into the street, and continued his sermon in the open air; but the sectaries were so noisy, citing against him passages from the sacred Scriptures, that he was obliged to stop.[1] The bishops afterwards succeeded in once more apprehending Henry, and the archbishop Samson, of Rheims, brought him before the council held in that city, in 1148. On the information of the archbishop, who disapproved of capital and corporeal punishments against heretics, he was simply condemned to imprisonment during life, with a meagre diet, that he might be brought to repentance.[2]

On observing the remarkable affinity of spirit and of principles between the Apostolicals in Cologne and Perigueux, the Petrobrusians and the Henricians, we might be led to suppose that this agreement must have been owing to a common external descent. But the question immediately occurs whether we should be justified in so doing; for when certain ideas and tendencies have once become incorporated in the process in which the spirit of a determinate period is developing itself, and prevail therein, they are wont to diffuse themselves abroad without any external cause, as through an atmosphere; and we see them breaking to view in one place and another without being able to trace the whole to any single point. It is manifest, at any rate, that Peter of Bruis and Henry made their appearance quite independently of each other; and so it may have happened also with other individuals and entire communities. Nothing therefore would be gained, even if the prelates succeeded in silencing the individual representatives and organs of such general tendencies to reform. These tendencies, especially in South France, had acquired too much strength to be suppressed by the destruction of the individual organs. The corruption of the clergy had, even in places where the church system of doctrine was still held fast, excited great dissatisfaction and violent complaints, as appears evident from the songs of the Troubadours, who came from these districts, where this tone of feeling is not to be mistaken.[3] In such a tone of feeling a thorough and

[1] When he left this castle without having accomplished his object, he is said to have exclaimed with his characteristic assurance, which sometimes gave him the appearance of a prophet, alluding to the name of this castle, Viride folium: "Viride folium, desiccet te Deus." Which curse people believed was fulfilled. See the Chronica Guil. Pod. Laurent. in Du Chesne, t. v. f. 667.

[2] If this story were found only in the chronicle of Alberic (pp. 315, 317), we might regard it as not sufficiently well vouched; for this chronicler classes Henry with the crazy enthusiast Eudo, and other opponents of the dominant church. But he names his authority, which is perfectly trustworthy, the Verbum Abbreviatum of Peter Cantor, where we actually find the passage cited above (p. 587), where this Henry is undoubtedly meant.

[3] See the examples of vehemence and boldness with which the Troubadours attacked the ambition and cupidity of the Roman court and of the clergy, and pointed their satire against the whole

radical spirit of reformation, going back from the corruption of the church in life, to the corruption in doctrine, and aiming at the renovation of everything, as well in doctrine as in practice, after the pattern of the apostolic church, must have found its true element. The sect of the *Waldenses*, presently to be mentioned, which, free from the disturbing and fanatical elements hitherto seen intermingling with reformatory antagonisms, survived as the purest offspring of the reaction of a purified Christian consciousness all the earlier appearances of its kind, and propagated itself in spite of every form of persecution through the succeeding centuries, presents itself, accordingly, not merely as the work of an individual man, excited to it by external occasions, but as a single link in the chain of reactions, running through this whole period of reactions of the Christian consciousness, against the churchly theocratic system of the Middle Ages; one form of the manifestation of that idea of following the apostles in evangelical poverty, which had its ground in the religious consciousness of the period, a product from the laboratory of the Christian mind in these districts. It was quite a mistake to think of deriving this sect from an outward connection with manifestations of some such reaction of the reforming spirit subsequent to the time of Claudius of Turin, and that too in districts whither this sect, which arose in another quarter, was certainly first transplanted at a later period. But it was not without some foundation of truth that the Waldenses of this period asserted the high antiquity of their sect, and maintained that from the time of the secularization of the church — that is, as they believed, from the time of Constantine's gift to the Roman bishop Silvester — such an opposition as finally broke forth in them, had been existing all along.[1] We recognize this spirit, which gave birth to the Waldensian sect, in a writing on the antichrist in the Romance language, which certainly belongs to the twelfth century,[2] though the date assigned in the manuscript (1120) is of uncertain authority, and the question whether this document proceeded from the Waldenses, or is of an older origin, cannot now be decided. The idea set forth in this production bears witness of the circumstances of the times in which it was produced. By the antichrist, is here understood the whole antichristlike principle, concealing itself under the guise of Christianity, which principle

subject of indulgences, in Raynouard Choix des poésies originales des Troubadours, t. ii, Paris, 1817, in the Introductory Essay, p. 61. It is said of the church, that, yielding to the cupidity by which she suffered herself to be governed, she sold pardons for all kinds of iniquity at a paltry price; of the priests, that they were eager to grasp wealth with both hands, whatever wretchedness it might occasion; that they sometimes used prayer, and sometimes the sharp edge of the sword, as a means of persecution, — deluding some with God, others with the devil; of Rome, that she despised God and the saints; that craft and treachery of all kinds leagued together and lurked there.

[1] See Pilichdorf contra Waldenses, c. i, Bibl. patr. Lugd. t. xxv, f. 278: Coram simplicibus mentiuntur, sectam eorum durasse a temporibus Silvestri papae, quando videlicet ecclesia coepit habere proprias possessiones. It is remarkable that Rainer, who points to the true historical origin of the sect, still reckons among the reasons why this sect was more mischievous than any other, its longer duration: Aliqui enim dicunt, quod duraverit a tempore Silvestri, aliqui a tempore apostolorum.

[2] Published in Paul Perrin's Histoire des Vaudois, lib. iii.

had from the time of the apostles been continually unfolding itself, till finally in this period, as was shown in the particular manifestations of churchly corruption, it had reached its climax. "Although antichrist," it is here said, "was already born in the times of the apostles, yet because he was only in the stage of infancy, he was still without his interior and exterior members.[1] It was more easy, therefore, to recognize and destroy him, since he was rustic and gross, and had been formed a mute.[2] But since that time he has grown up to his members, and attained to the complete age of manhood. We are not, therefore, to expect antichrist as one that is yet to come; so far from that, he is already old; his power and authority have begun already to diminish, for already the Lord slays this godless beast by the spirit of his mouth, by many men of good disposition,[3] sending forth a power which is opposed to his, and to that of those who are fond of him." We see, then, that this book was composed at a time when several antagonists of the church system had already made their appearance in these districts, when their doctrines had met with acceptance from the people, and it already seemed that the hierarchy must give way to a purer and freer progress of evangelical truth. This is precisely the time of which we speak.

All the accounts which go back to the origin of the sect agree in this, that it started with a rich citizen of Lyons, by the name of Peter Waldus (Pierre de Vaux).[4] At a certain time, when he happened to be attending an assembly of respectable citizens in Lyons, one of the number suddenly expired. This incident, reminding him of the lot which might at any time be his own, left on him so powerful an impression that he resolved to abandon all other concerns, and to occupy himself solely with the concerns of religion. He felt an earnest desire to obtain, from the original fountain itself, a more exact knowledge of the doctrines of salvation, than what he could derive from the passages of Holy Scripture cited by the preachers. For this reason, he gave to two ecclesiastics, one Stephen de Ansa, a man of some learning, the other Bernard Ydros, who was a practised writer, a certain sum of money, on condition they would prepare for him a translation of the gospels and other portions of the Bible into the Romance language,

[1] Al temp de li apostol ia sia zo que l'Antechrist era ia conceopu, ma, car essent enfant, mancava de li debit membre interiors et exteriors.

[2] Enaima rostic et grossier, el era fait mut.

[3] Car el es fait de Dio ja veil et que el descreis ia: car la soa potesta et authorita es amerma et que lo Seignor Jesus occi aquest felon per lo Sperit de la soa bocca en molti home de bona volunta.

[4] This, Rainer, with other contemporaries says (c. v.). Particularly weighty is the testimony of the Dominican Stephen de Borbone, or de Bella Villa, in his book De septem donis Spiritus sancti; from which book, hidden among the manuscripts of the library of the Sorbonne, D'Argentre has communicated a passage which belongs here, in the Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, t. i, f. 85. This person was himself a resident at Lyons in the year 1223, and two years later composed this work. He had his accounts from several persons who had associated with the founders of the Waldensian sect, and particularly with that ecclesiastic Ydros whom Peter Waldus employed as a writer. If Pilichdorf (c. i.) derives the surname of Peter Waldus or Waldenses from his native place, and says that another man from Lyons, by the name of John, was associated with him, this does not essentially disagree with the other accounts.

which one was to dictate, the other write down.[1] He procured to be drawn up, also, by the same persons, a collection of sayings of the church fathers, on matters of faith and practice,—so-called *Sententiae*. These writings he read with great diligence, and so the religious direction he had received from the incident above mentioned was more and more confirmed, and he was now seized with an earnest desire to follow the apostles in evangelical poverty. He distributed all his property amongst the poor, and proposed to found a spiritual society of Apostolicals, a society for the spread of evangelical truth, in knowledge and life, among the neglected people, in city and country. He employed, for this purpose, multiplied copies of his Romance version of the Scriptures, which, by degrees, was extended to the whole Bible. He and his companions labored with great zeal, and certainly without any thought, at first, of separating themselves from the church, but simply aiming at a spiritual society, like many others in the service of the church; with this difference, that while other founders of such societies were animated with a zeal for the church, and its laws possessed for them all the force of truth drawn directly from the Word of God, Peter Waldus, on the other hand, was influenced more by the truth derived immediately from the Scriptures; though this was still mixed up, in his case, with the church-doctrines of those times, and heterogeneous elements were, at first, blended together. Practical religion was the great thing with him. He entered into no conscious opposition with the doctrines of the church, and it was impossible to descry anything heretical in this society. The ecclesiastical authorities might have adopted such a society, and taken the direction of it into their own hands.[2] But an influential union of laymen, associated for the purpose of preaching to the people; a union which had sprung up, independently of the clerus, from among the laity, and made the sacred Scriptures themselves the source of religious doctrine, might, however, appear to be something contrary to ecclesiastical order, and excite the jealousy and the suspicion of the clerus. This society, though not conscious as yet of any opposition with the Catholic element, was, from the first, distinguished from other such societies by the fact that this element exercised no particular power over the feelings and imagination, but retired out of sight before a sober, practical, biblical element of the religion of the heart. Those who were governed by the church spirit, certainly felt some such difference. The archbishop of Lyons was for suppressing the whole by an authoritative decision. He forbade Peter Waldus and his companions to expound the Scriptures and to preach. But they did not think they ought, in obedience to this magisterial decree, to desist from a calling which, they were conscious, was from God. Declaring that they were bound to obey God rather than man, they persevered in the work which they had begun. Even yet, however, they entertained no thought of forming a sect separate from and standing forth hostile to the church. One other means remained, by which they might

[1] The above-named Stephen de Bordone was personally acquainted with both these ecclesiastics.

[2] As was exemplified in that society of Raymund Palmaris. See p. 297.

be enabled to unite the continuance of their spiritual activity with obedience to the church, namely, by applying to the pope himself. This they undertook to do. They sent delegates from their body to pope Alexander the Third, transmitting to him a copy of their Romance version of the Bible, and soliciting his approbation as well of that as of their spiritual society.[1] The matter was discussed before the Lateran council, then assembled, in the year 1170. Interesting is the account which the Franciscan monk, Walter Mapes of England, who was present at this council, has given of the Waldenses, from his personal observation. "They have no settled place of abode. They go about barefoot, two by two, in woollen garments, possessing nothing, but, like the apostles, having all things in common; following, naked, him who had not where to lay his head." A commission was appointed to institute an exact examination of the case. The above Franciscan was a member of it. He says that he took pains to enter, with them, into an investigation of their religious knowledge and of their orthodoxy. They appeared to him an uneducated, ignorant people; and he was surprised that the council had thought it worth while to have anything to do with such people. He conversed with two, who seemed to be regarded as leaders; but the examination which he held with them did not relate to their knowledge of the Christian religion, but to their knowledge of the scholastic terminology of the church, in which, as we may well suppose, these pious, unlearned laymen were but poorly versed. He asked them, first, whether they believed on God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? to which they could, with perfect propriety, reply in the affirmative. He then asked them, if they also believed on the mother of Christ? The poor people, who knew nothing about the common distinction, in the doctrinal language of the schools, between *credere aliquid* and *in aliquid*, and supposed that they were simply called upon to explain whether they were infected or not with the heretical opinions concerning Mary, answered this question also in the affirmative, which was followed with a general shout of laughter. Yet this Walter Mapes, who thought himself entitled to regard the Waldenses with so much contempt, must have known how much might have been effected by their enthusiastic zeal, what power might flow from the reaction of such a principle as exhibited itself in the Waldenses; for he says of them: "They began at present in the humblest manner, because they had not as yet gained any firm footing; but had we suffered them to gain admittance, we should have been driven out ourselves."[2] The pope refused the Waldenses the wished-for permission, and forbade them to preach or expound the Scriptures. It now became necessary for them to

[1] We owe these statements to an eye-witness, the English Franciscan Walter Mapes (Mapeus), who, in his work De nugis curialium, to be found among the manuscripts of the Bodleian library at Oxford, has given an account of this embassy of the Waldenses and of his conversation with two of the number. This part of the above-named work has been published by archbishop Usher (Usserius), in his work, De christianarum ecclesiarum in occidentis praesertim partibus continua successione et statu. Londini, 1687, f. 112.

[2] Humillimo nunc incipiunt modo, quia pedem inferre nequeunt, quos si admiserimus, expellemur.

decide whether they should obey, and desist from their work, or stand forth in open opposition to the church. Among the sects on whom, at this Lateran council, the sentence of condemnation was pronounced, the adherents of Peter Waldus do not occur. It was necessary, indeed, to wait and see what course they themselves would take after this papal prohibition. But being sure of their cause as being from God, no papal authority could induce them to give it up; and they must necessarily appear, therefore, as declared enemies of the church, as in fact they were considered, under the above-named pope's successor, Lucius the Third. Without any doubt it was those Waldenses, who were condemned, in 1183, by the last-named pope, together with other heretics, under the name of persons *qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur*. Certainly this is a surname which the Waldenses applied to themselves, as followers of the apostolical poverty; as from their wooden shoes,[1] which they also considered to be a mark of the apostolical dress,[2] they were called *Sabôtiers*, *insabbatati*. But though they were, at first, for following the apostles in coarseness of dress, according to the common notions of their times, yet afterwards, by their continual study of the New Testament, they would be led to a purer knowledge and a freer direction in regard to all such matters; for one of their opponents says afterwards of them, that their dress was neither expensive nor yet altogether mean. They rapidly spread themselves from South France to Italy, where they appear under the name of the *Pauperes de Lombardia;* the Piedmontese mountains, those districts in which Claudius of Turin had formerly labored, soon furnished them a permanent home, where they continued to propagate themselves in the midst of persecutions.[3] We have before[4] seen how already, under Innocent the Third, they found an entrance into the districts on the Rhine; how societies of laymen, in which men zealously studied and sought edification from the Bible, afford indications of the influence of the Waldenses. Though it was imagined that the sect had been totally exterminated in this quarter, yet a remnant of it may have been saved, which continued to propagate itself in secret. In the year 1231, a multitude of heretics suddenly appear in the districts on the Rhine and other countries of Germany; and the persecution against them continued raging for three years. At Triers were to be found three schools of the heretics. There seem to have been various sects, it is true; but the spread of German versions of the Bible, and the doctrine of the universal priesthood, are certainly marks which indicate the Waldenses.[5] As accord-

[1] Such wooden shoes were called *sabôts*.

[2] Ebrard, c. xxv: Etiam sabatatenses a sabatata potius quam Christiani a Christo se volunt appellari.

[3] The records of the archives of Turin are said to testify of this. See the tract. Frà Dolcino, and the Patarenes of Julius Krone, Leips. 1844, p. 22, note. There is cited here a command already issued. by the emperor Otho the Fourth, against the haereticos Valdenses, qui in Taurinensi dioecesi zizania seminant.

[4] See above, p. 321.

[5] See the report of a contemporary, in the Memorabilia of the archbishops of Triers (Gesta Trevirorum, ed. Augustae Trevirorum, 1836, vol. i, c. civ, p. 319): Et plures erant sectae et multi earum instructi erant scripturis sanctis, quas habebant in theutonicam translatas; and among their doc-

ing to what we have already said,[1] the entrance which the Catharists found into these districts was facilitated by the contests between the popes and the Hohenstaufens, the same was undoubtedly the case, also with the Waldenses.

When Innocent the Fourth was venting his fury against the Hohenstaufen family, and suspending ban and interdict over those who stood faithful to that house, heretics spread, as a contemporary writer reports,[2] at Halle in Suabia. They rang the tocsin, and collected together the lords and nobles from the surrounding country, and preached, publicly, that the pope and all ecclesiastics of the higher and lower classes were heretics and traitors to the people. They had no power to bind and to loose, and could administer no sacraments, as they lived in every species of vice. Neither pope nor bishop could lay an interdict on a people. Men should not allow themselves to be deprived of the blessing of divine worship by their arbitrary will. They denounced the Franciscans and Dominicans as people who had brought the church to ruin by their false preaching, and who led vicious lives. As there was no one to speak the truth, and to give force to the right faith by a right course of living; God, who, when others kept silent, was able to raise up preachers from the very stones, had called them, they said, to proclaim the truth. "We preach to you," they exclaimed, "no lying indulgence, such as the pope and the bishops have invented, but we preach that which God alone and our community are able to bestow."[3] They called upon the people to pray, not for the pope, whose life was so wicked that he deserved not to be mentioned; but for the emperor Frederic, and his son Conrad the Fourth; for these were honest men. Yet there is nothing in the facts here stated, which would lead us to think particularly of the Waldenses. The noisy demonstration seems more like the manner of other sects, than the Waldenses. Neither does what these people held concerning the forgiveness of sins, which one could receive by their "order" alone, in case their representations are correctly reported, answer to the principles of the Waldenses; nor the fact that, for the time being, they allowed a value to be attached to masses for departed souls, for the purpose of stirring up the people against the interdict.[4] If we are not to suppose here some community or other of Apostolicals, called forth by opposition to the worldliness of the church, we might perhaps suppose Catharists, whose crafty management, which was not always in strict accordance with the principle of veracity, perhaps here betrays itself. It was, moreover, in conformity with their policy, to draw the people to them at first by opposition, and to let nothing be known, at the outset, concerning their doctrine.

trines: indifferentes corpus Domini a viro et muliere, ordinato et non ordinato, in scutella et callice et ubique locorum posse confici dicebant.

[1] Page 582.

[2] The abbot Albert of Stade in his Chronicle, at the year 1248, ed. Helmstad. 1587, p. 220.

[3] Indulgentiam, quam damus vobis, non damus fictam vel compositam ab apostolico vel episcopis, sed de solo Deo et ordine nostro.

[4] Thus they are reported to have said: Ut missas audirent super animam ipsorum et sacramento ecclesiae libere perciperent, quia ipsis perceptis mundificarentur.

As the origin of the Waldenses is to be traced to the reading of the Bible, they always remained true to this direction. A great knowledge of the Bible distinguished men and women among them; and this circumstance, contrasted with the ignorance of the Scriptures among the clergy, contributed to their spread. Rainer reckons among the means which served to promote the sect, the translation of the Old and New Testaments into the spoken language of the country. The same writer mentions in this connection, that he had seen an illiterate peasant who had learned by heart the book of Job, and several others who had committed the entire New Testament.[1] He says: "Among all the sects that have hitherto existed, there has been none more pernicious to the church than the sect of the Leonists (Waldenses of Lyons); because it is the most universally spread; for there is hardly a country where they are not to be found. Next, because while other sects repel their hearers by the blasphemous character of their doctrines, the Leonists maintained a great show of piety; because they led a pious life before the eyes of men, were quite orthodox in their doctrine concerning God, and adopted all the articles of the apostolic creed. They only abused the church of Rome, and the clergy, in doing which they found ready hearers among the people."[2] The same writer represents the heretics, by whom doubtless he means more particularly the Waldenses, as saying: "With us, men and women teach, and he who is but a scholar of seven days already teaches others. Among the Catholics, a teacher is rarely to be met with who can repeat from memory, letter for letter, three chapters of the Bible. But with us, a man or woman is rarely to be found who cannot repeat the entire New Testament in the vernacular language."[3] Ignorant priests in South France would invite, therefore, the Waldenses to dispute with other sects, whom they found it difficult to manage themselves on account of their ignorance of the Scriptures.[4] And Rainer, where speaking of the sects generally he seems to have the Waldenses chiefly in his eye, thus describes their mode of living:[5] "They are orderly and modest in their manners; their dress is neither expensive nor mean; that they may eschew oaths, falsehood, and fraud, they engage in no sort of traffic.[6] They live on what they earn by the labor of their hands from day to day. Even shoemakers are teachers among them. They amass no wealth,[7] but are contented with the bare necessaries of life. They are also chaste," where he adds, "especially the Waldenses. They are never found hanging about wine-shops; they attend no balls nor other vanities. They govern their passions; they are always at

[1] Rainer, c. iii.

[2] Cui multitudo laïcorum facilis est ad credendum. L. c. c. iv [3] L. c. c. viii.

[4] So, says William of Puy Laurent, in the prologue to his work above referred to, in Du Chesne, t. v, f. 666: Illi Waldenses contra alios acutissime disputabant, unde et in eorum odium alii admittebantur a sacerdotibus idiotis. These words may indeed be understood to mean that the ignorant priests had called in the assistance of other sects to conduct the dispute with the Waldenses, whom they found it very difficult to refute.

[5] c. vii.

[6] Which could not be said of the Catharists, as is evident from what is cited above, p. 583.

[7] Neither can this apply to the Catharists See above, p. 583.

work; and on this account learn, or teach and pray, but little."[1] Afterwards, to be sure, this writer mentions also, as a characteristic of the sect, that they hypocritically confessed and took part in the mass. This, as is evident from what has been remarked above,[2] may apply perhaps to the Catharists, but hardly to the Waldenses. Though in general they supported themselves by manual labor rather than by trade, and scattered themselves more among the people than among the nobles, yet a number of them dealt in jewels and ornaments of dress as a means of obtaining access to the families of the great. When they had disposed of rings and trinkets, and were asked if they had nothing more to sell, they answered: "Yes, we have jewels still more precious than any you have seen; we would be glad to show you these also, if you would promise not to betray us to the clergy." On being assured that they should be safe, they said: "We have a precious stone, so brilliant, that by its light a man may see God; another, which radiates such a fire as to enkindle the love of God in the heart of its possessor," — and so they went on. The precious stones which they meant, were passages of the Holy Scriptures in their various application.[3]

Pope Innocent the Third seems to have been aware of the mistake committed by his predecessor in compelling the Waldenses to break away, contrary to their own original intention, from the church; and he sought to correct it. He was for converting the Waldenses from an heretical society into a church society of *pauperes Catholici*. Some ecclesiastics of South France, who had belonged to the Waldenses, took the lead in an enterprise of this sort; particularly, a certain Durand de Osca. They first went to Rome, where they submitted to the pope a confession of faith containing everything belonging in general to orthodoxy, and opposed in particular to the antichurchly tendencies and opinions of the Waldenses. The pope confirmed the new society of *pauperes Catholici*, formed of Waldenses who had returned back to the church. The ecclesiastics and better educated were to busy themselves with preaching, exposition of the Bible, religious instruction, and combating the sects; but all the laity, who were not qualified to exhort the people and combat the sects, should occupy houses by themselves, where they were to live in a pious and orderly manner. This spiritual society, so remodelled, should endeavor to bring about a reunion of all the Waldenses with the church. As the Waldenses held it unchristian to shed blood and to swear, and the presiding officers of the new spiritual society begged the pope that those who were disposed to join them should be released from all obligation of complying with customs of this sort, the pope granted, at their request, that all such as joined them should not be liable to be called upon for military service against Christians, nor to take an oath in civil processes; adding, indeed, the important clause, — so far as this rule could

[1] The last could not of course be a matter of outward observation for others

[2] P. 611.

[3] See c. viii. That the particular passages here cited should be the angel's salutation to Mary with the annunciation of our Saviour's nativity, and the 13th chapter of John relating to the washing of the disciples' feet, points to the Waldenses rather than to the Catharists.

be observed in a healthful manner without injury or offence to others: and, especially, with the permission of the secular lords.[1] In Italy and Spain, also, the zeal of these representatives of the church tendency among the Waldenses seemed to meet with acceptance. The pope gladly lent a hand in promoting its more general spread, and he was inclined to grant to those who came over to it, when they had once become reconciled with the church, various marks of favor. But he insisted on unconditional submission; and refused to enter into any conditional engagements. There were a hundred Waldenses in Milan who declared themselves ready to come back to the church on condition that a certain piece of property on which they had erected a house for their meetings, which had been demolished by the archbishop, should be restored to them for the purpose of rebuilding on it another edifice for similar purposes. But this the pope did not think proper to grant, because the fellowship of the church must not be sought after from motives of temporal interest, but solely to advance the interests of the soul. Yet, at the same time, Innocent issued a brief to the archbishop of Milan,[2] inviting him to receive those Waldenses — if they were disposed to be reconciled with God and the church for the sake of their own salvation — with due tenderness into the bosom of the church; and then if, according to the wisdom which God had given him, it appeared consistent as well with the honor as with the well-being of the church so to do, he might grant them this or some other place where they might meet in the fear of God, for the purpose of exhorting each other and their friends, so far as this could be done without any grievous scandal to others.[3] But in the bishops generally, who perhaps might have cause for not placing full confidence in this conversion of the Waldenses, the pope found no inclination to second his own milder views; and he had to complain that the bishops of the diocese of Tarraco sought evasions, with a view to put off the readmission of them into the fellowship of the church; and in a letter to those bishops,[4] bidding them delay the thing no longer, he assured them it could not be his will that, by their *harshness*, any who seemed to be drawn by the divine grace should be repelled from the boundless mercy of God.[5] In Catalonia, this spiritual society of *pauperes Catholici* maintained itself for some time. At its head stood the above-named Durand of Osca, who had written some tracts against the Waldenses. But though at an earlier period, before the principle lying at bottom of the tendency of the Waldenses had been fully developed, such measures for their reunion with the dominant church might have been successful, it was now too late; and even that society

[1] See Innocent, epp. lib. xi, ep. 198.

[2] L. c. lib. xii, ep. 17.

[3] Et si demum secundum datam vobis a Deo prudentiam tam ecclesiasticae honestati quam eorum saluti videritis expedire, pratum praedictum seu alium locum idoneum, in quo ad exhortandum se ipsos et amicos eorum cum timore Domini valeant convenire, concedatis eisdem sine gravi scandalo aliorum, quoniam aliter est cum conversis quam cum perversis agendum Lib. xii, ep. 17.

[4] Lib. xiii, ep. 78.

[5] Nolentes, sicut etiam nec velle debemus, ut qui trahi gratia divina creduntur, per duritiam vestram ab infinita Dei misericordia repellantur.

is said to have gradually fallen to decay.[1] When a bishop of South France asked a highly respected knight of this district, why they did not expel the Waldenses from their province, he answered: "We cannot do it; for we have grown up with them, and have kinsmen among them; besides, we see them living in all honesty."[2]

The Waldenses went on the principle that the Sacred Scriptures, independent of every other authority, explained from themselves, are to be recognized as the only source of the knowledge of the Christian faith; and that whatever could not be derived from them ought to be rejected. They must of course then, when expelled from the church, since they were freed from the restraint of all other considerations, be led to a knowledge of Christian doctrine which would every day become purer, and to a rejection of the statutes at variance therewith, which would every day become more complete. Thus, for example, it is certain that they combated all those doctrines which had grown out of a confusion of the Old and New Testament points of view; as, for instance, that of a necessary special priesthood,—all that was connected with the church theocracy, the doctrine of the seven sacraments, of the sacrifice of the mass, of transubstantiation, of the worship of saints, of purgatory, and its associate dogma, that of indulgences. This is shown by the writings composed in these times[3] against the Waldenses, and by the minutes of trials published by Philip of Limborch.[4] They revived the consciousness of the universal Christian priesthood; hence, laymen among them heard confessions, gave absolution, bestowed baptism, and the Lord's supper.[5] By this doctrine of the universal priesthood was not excluded, however, the idea of certain ecclesiastical offices which subsisted among them, and which had been arranged at a very early period, to say the least, in their body.[6] Starting from the literal understanding of the Bible, they condemned absolutely the oath, all shedding of blood, military service, and the punishment of death.[7] As they found unconditional truth enjoined in the

[1] See the Chronicle of William Puy of Laurent, c. viii, where it is said of them: Hi in quadam parte Catalauniae annis pluribus sic vixerunt, sed paulatim postea defecerunt.

[2] L. c.

[3] See e. g. the above-cited tract of Pilichdorf, from the twentieth chapter onward.

[4] See the above-cited work on the History of the Inquisition. Thus, e. g. f. 201: Dicti Valdenses credunt, quod in praesenti vita solum sit poenitentia et sit purgatorium pro peccatis et quando anima recedit a corpore, vadit ad paradisum vel ad infernum et non faciunt orationes nec alia suffragia pro defunctis, quia dicunt, quod illi, qui sunt in paradiso, non indigent et illis, qui sunt in inferno, non prodessent.

[5] In the above protocol of the Inquisition (f. 251), a married countryman is mentioned who used common bread in consecrating and distributing the Lord's supper. Many peculiar and dark things are said touching the wine which they used. The consecrated bread was preserved, and a portion of it eaten daily. It is said of one who died while a member of this sect: Quod credebat et asserebat, se habere potestatem a Domino, celebrandi missam et consecrandi verum corpus Christi de materia panis communis fermentati et verum sanguinem de vino cum oleo et sale commixtis in scipho ligneo cum pede, quem ad hoc loco calicis secum habebat, quamvis esset laïcus uxoratus, laborator et agricola. He celebrated the mass at home on Sundays and festivals, et de prodicto pane ac poculo communicabat singulis diebus cujuslibet hebdomadis, quando sibi vacabat, de peciis panis sic per eum consecratis, quas in pixide conservabat, sumendo de mane pro communione diebus singulis.

[6] F. 290. At the commencement of the fourteenth century occurs a Majoralis of the Waldensian sect.

[7] See f. 201 and 207, and other passages

sermon on the mount, they are said to have considered every utterance of a falschood a mortal sin."[1] The spirit of a truly evangelical bent expresses itself also in the confessions composed in the Romance language, which bear the very impress of those times when the Waldenses arose. Among these belongs the tract on antichrist, already noticed. Everything is, according to this document, a work of antichrist, by which men are led from relying on Christ alone, to place their trust in external things; which ascribes renewal by the Holy Ghost to a dead, outward faith, and to the baptism of infants on the ground of such faith.[2] This might lead us to infer, though not with absolute certainty, that the author of the tract was an opponent of infant baptism. It was also described as a work of antichrist, that he built the whole fabric of religion and holiness in the people upon his mass, and worked up in it a tissue of various Jewish, pagan, and Christian ceremonies.[3] It is said that antichrist covers up his wickedness under some few words of Christ, under the writings of the ancients and the councils, which the servants of antichrist observe, just so far as they may, without danger of any interference with their wicked lives and their sinful pleasures.[4] The author reckons among the things that serve to conceal antichrist, the partly hypocritical, partly truly pious life of many in the church; for the elect of God, who choose and practise goodness, being in the church of antichrist, were captives in Babylon, and serve as the gold with which antichrist covers his vanity. The people in whose name this tract was composed, deemed themselves bound to renounce antichrist inwardly and outwardly;[5] they had a fellowship and unity of good-will, and of a sincere disposition among one another, since they proposed to themselves the pure and simple end of pleasing the Lord and attaining to salvation. They declared themselves to be resolved, with the Lord's help, to embrace, so far as their minds were capable of bearing it, the truth of Christ and of his bride, small as their knowledge of it might be. If to any man more knowledge of the truth was given, then, they more humbly desired to be taught by him, and to be corrected of their mistakes. Forgiveness of sins is bestowed by that fulness of authority which is in God, through the mediation of Christ, and men obtain it by faith, hope, penitence, love; by obedience to the Word.[6] Among the means employed by antichrist to cover his wickedness, they reckoned the miracles now and then performed,—noticing the fact that St. Paul enumerates among the signs of antichrist, lying wonders.[7]

If, as is here said, they appealed to the passage, "Judge not that ye be not judged," they must, of course, have condemned all civil trials.

[1] See Alan. c. Valdenses, lib. ii, p. 206.

[2] Que el attribuis la reformation del Sanct Sperit a la fe morta de fora et bapteia li enfant en aquella fe.

[3] La quarta obra de l'Antechrist es laqual ensemp bastic et edifique tota religion et sanctita del poble en la soa messa et ensemp ha teissut varias caeremonias en un Judaicas et de li Gentil et de li Christian.

[4] Los quals illi gardan, entant quant non destruon la mala vita et volupta de lor.

[5] Nos fazen departiment exterior et interior de luy.

[6] Car illi es en Dio authoritativament et en Christ ministerialment, per se, per speranza, per penitentia, per carita, per obedientia de parola en l'home participativamente.

[7] See lib. iii, p. 271.

A second beautiful monument of this Christian spirit is the sketch of Christian doctrine intituled the Noble Lesson.[1] We have no just grounds for skepticism with regard to the date which this production attributes to itself, and this date places it in the early days of the Waldenses; for it is observed that but eleven centuries had elapsed since it was said, that we live in the last times; — whether the passages in the epistle of St. Paul, of which mention is made in the immediate context, or in the Apocalypse are intended. The chronological determination agrees with the times, in either case, unless we suppose a calculation exact to the letter. In the Noble Lesson, the following contrast is drawn between the old law and the new. The old, curses the body that brings forth no fruit; the new, recommends the life of virginity.[2] The old, forbids perjury alone; the new, swearing in general;[3] it bids us say simply yea and nay. The prohibition of all shedding of blood is also cited. The apostles are represented as patterns of spiritual, voluntary poverty;[4] they were contented with food and raiment. They find, however, but very few followers after them. After the times of the apostles, there were some teachers, it is said, who showed the way of Christ our Saviour. But at present, also, there are a few who earnestly desire to show the way of Christ; but they are so persecuted, that it is hardly in their power to do so. They are especially persecuted by the false shepherds. If an individual is still to be found who neither curses, swears, lies, commits adultery, murders, possesses himself of another's goods, nor revenges himself on his enemies, they say he is a Waldensian, and deserves to be punished.[5] Against the priestly power of the keys, it is said, the popes since the times of Silvester, the cardinals, bishops, and abbots, all put together, have not even power to forgive a single mortal sin. God alone can forgive sins. It belongs to the shepherds, simply, to preach to the people, to pray for them, to exhort the people to repentance and a sincere confession of their sins; to fast, give alms, and pray with fervent hearts; for by these means the souls of bad Christians who have sinned may attain to salvation.[6] The doctrines of the Waldenses thus expressed perfectly harmonize with what we have said concerning the origin of this sect, as one which is to be traced to the idea of the evangelical poverty; and we perceive how the evangelical spirit in it gradually attained to a freer development.[7]

[1] La nobla Leyczon, noble leçon, first published by Léger, in his Histoire des Vaudois; — a more complete reprint in the Choix des poésies originales des Troubadours, par Raynouard. T. ii, p. 76.

[2] La ley velha maudi lo ventre, que fruc non a porta,
Ma la novella conselha, gardan vergeneta.

[3] La ley velha deffent solament perjurar,
Ma la novella di al pos tot non jurar.

[4] Poverta spiritual. Que volhan esser paure per propria volunta.

[5] Qu'es Vaudes e degne de punir.

[6] Car per aquestas cosas troba l'arma salvament,
De nos caytio Crestians, lical haven pecca.

[7] Maitland, in his work entitled Facts and Documents illustrative of the history, doctrine, and rites of the ancient Albigenses and Waldenses, London. 1832, p. 115, has very properly directed attention to the criticism necessary to be employed in the use of the ancient confessions of the Waldenses; but he has certainly carried his doubts too far. One mark of spuriousness cited by him, the divisions of the Bible into chap

It was in the order of the Franciscans we saw the idea of evangelical poverty first introduced into the hierarchy; but we also saw[1] how the popes, by their participation in the disputes within this order, in which they sided with the milder party among the Franciscans, became involved in a contest with the *zelantes* and *spirituales*, and how it thus came about that the idea of evangelical poverty raised to importance by this party took another direction, was set up against the worldliness of a church corrupted by the superfluity of earthly goods, and by means of this antagonism many others might be called forth, which from the point of view occupied by this party could not fail to appear heretical. Added to this was the influence of those prophetical ideas, of which we spoke in the first section, and which, propagated ever since the middle of the twelfth century, had been continually shaping themselves out into greater distinctness; particularly those ideas in the peculiar form in which they are presented by the abbot Joachim, whose profound thoughts and intuitions operated in various ways to stimulate and fructify inquiry. The exposition of the Apocalypse opened a wide field of imaginative conjecture to minds deeply conscious of the corruption of the church in their times, and piercing with a spirit of divination into the future. As the signs of the times, which are presented in that production of Joachim as tokens of the last great conflict, were, in the important epochs of new evolutions of the kingdom of God repeated in manifold[2] forms, and exalted to a still higher significance, so the opinion, which indeed contained something of truth, that this final judgment was hinted at by signs corresponding to the predictions of the Apocalypse, might the more easily obtain credence. The abbot Joachim had given the impulse to that kind of speculation by which men were led to trace in certain correspondences, in which one step prefigured that which was to follow, the progressive fulfilment of the prophetic element in the unfolding thread of historical facts. The ideas of the evangelical poverty and of the age of the Holy Spirit were in these intuitions combined together; there were, however, different spiritual tendencies, agreeing only in their opposition to the existing church form, which seized and appropriated these ideas after different ways;

ters, first introduced after the middle of the thirteenth century (yet it is already to be met with in William of Paris), may no doubt excite suspicions against the statement that the above-cited tract concerning antichrist originated in the 12th century, if this division was to be found in the original form of that document. But the whole character of the document, as well as of the last named Noble Leçon, harmonizes with this period of time. As it regards the style and language, respecting which I am not qualified to judge, I must rely here on the judgment of that competent critic, Raynouard. Maitland supposes, it is true, the antique form of the language is no proof of its genuineness. Whoever was interested, he thinks, to forge such documents, might also take pains to imitate the language. But what interest could a later Waldensian be supposed to have, in forging two documents like these, in which there are still many things which do not agree with the doctrines of the Waldenses according to their later form?

[1] See above, p. 291.

[2] There is much truth in the remark which Hamann made in a letter to Herder, relative to the New Testament prophecies of the last times, where he says of the Apocalypse: "I accordingly did not consider the book as entirely fulfilled, but, like Judaism itself, as partly a standing, partly a progressive fulfilment. The actual fulfilment of the book is but a type of a higher fulfilment." See Hamann's writings, edited by F. Roth. Vol. vi, p. 111.

sometimes, as we saw in the sect of Almaric of Bena, a mystical pantheism, which would exchange Christian theism, and the dependence of the religious consciousness on a Saviour of the world for the self-deification of mind, representing Christianity as being only a subordinate form of religion which the mind, when arrived at the age of manhood, should slough off; sometimes a tendency, which, conscious that Christianity is itself the absolute religion, strove after a freer and more perfect development of the same, whereby it was to break through all human ordinances.

As the strict Franciscans entertained a special reverence for the abbot Joachim, who had foretold their order and the regeneration of the church, of which they were to be the instrument, and occupied themselves a good deal with the explanation of his writings, the interpretation and application of the current ideas in the same, so a great deal was said among them about a new everlasting gospel. The idea of such a gospel belonged really among the characteristic and peculiar notions of Joachim; and we have seen how by this expression, borrowed from the 14th chapter of the Apocalypse (v. 6), he had understood, following the view of Origen, a new spiritual apprehension of Christianity, as opposed to the sensuous Catholic point of view, and answering to the age of the Holy Spirit. A great sensation was now created by a commentary on the eternal gospel, which after the middle of the thirteenth century, the Franciscan Gerhard,[1] who, by his zeal for Joachim's doctrines, involved himself in many persecutions and incurred an eighteen years' imprisonment,[2] published under the title of "*Introductorius in evangelium aeternum.*" Many vague notions were entertained about the eternal gospel of the Franciscans, arising from superficial views, or a superficial understanding of Joachim's writings, and the offspring of mere rumor or the heresy-hunting spirit. Men spoke of the eternal gospel as of a book composed under this title and circulated among the Franciscans.[3] Occasionally, also, this eternal gospel was confounded perhaps with the above-mentioned Introductorius. In reality, there was no book existing under this title of the

[1] Assuredly this person was not, as he was afterwards said to be (see the Directorium inquisitionis of the Dominican Nicholas Eymericus, f. 272), a friend and kindred spirit to that same John of Parma, who, on account of his severity as a reformer, and his zeal for the doctrines of Joachim, suffered much persecution, was deposed from his office as general of his order, and succeeded by Bonaventura. Who the author of this work was, may be gathered from a statement of the acts of process, preserved in the library of the Sorbonne at Paris, and drawn up by one of the members of the papal commission of three cardinals, appointed to examine the work, viz.: Hugo of St. Chers (see above, p. 426). See the work already cited relative to the writers of the Dominican order, by Quetif and Echard, t. i, f. 202: Processus in librum evangelii aeterni.

[2] See, respecting him, Wadding, Annals of the Franciscan order, t. iv, at the year 1256.

[3] So spoke that violent enemy of the mendicant monks, of whom we have spoken in the second section, p. 283, William of St. Amour. In his sermon, preached on St. James' and St. Philip's days in the above-cited edition of his works, p. 500, where he is describing the dangers which belonged to the signs of the last times, and without doubt had the Franciscans in his mind, he says: De istis periculis jam habemus quaedam Parisiis, scilicet librum illum, qui vocatur evangelium aeternum. Et nos vidimus non modicam partem illius libri et audivi, quod ubicunque est, tantum vel plus contineat ille liber quam tota biblia, which might certainly be said with propriety of the compass and extent of Joachim's writings.

Eternal Gospel; but all that is said about it relates simply to the writings of Joachim.[1] The opponents of the Franciscan order objected to the preachers of the eternal gospel, that, according to their opinion, Christianity was but a transient thing, and a new, more perfect religion, the absolute form, destined to endure forever, would succeed it. William of St. Amour says:[2] "For the past fifty-five years some have been striving to substitute in place of the gospel of Christ another gospel, which is said to be a more perfect one, which they called the gospel of the Holy Spirit, or the eternal gospel.[3] These doctrines, concerning a new eternal gospel, which was to be preached in the times of the antichrist, had already, in the year 1254, — where perhaps he refers to the appearance of the above-mentioned Introductorius, — been set forth at the very seat of theological studies in Paris. Whence it is manifest, that the antichristian doctrine would even now be preached from the pulpits, if there were not still something that *withholdeth* (2 Thessal. 2: 6), namely, the power of the pope and of the bishops. It is said in that accursed book, which they called the eternal gospel, which had already been made known in the church, that the eternal gospel is as much superior to the gospel of Christ, as the sun is to the moon in brightness, the kernel to the shell in value. The kingdom of the church, or the gospel of Christ, was to last only till the year 1260." In a sermon which we have already noticed,[4] he points out the following as doctrines of the eternal gospel: that the sacrament of the church is nothing; that a new law of life was to be given, and a new constitution of the church introduced; and he labors to show that on the contrary the form of the hierarchy, under which the church then subsisted, was one resting on the divine order, and altogether necessary and immutable.

These charges from the mouth of a passionate opponent cannot

[1] See the learned and profound essay on this subject by Dr. Engelhardt, in his Kirchengeschichtlichen Abhandlungen, Erlangen, 1832, p. 4, et f. This may be very distinctly gathered from the statement in the above-cited acts of the process on the Introductorius in evangelium aeternum, l. c. Quetif et Echard, f. 202, for here it is expressly stated: Quod liber concordiarum vel concordiæ veritatis appellaretur primus liber evangelii aeterni et quod liber iste, qui dicitur Apocalypsis nova, appellaretur secundus liber ejusdem evangelii, similiter, quod liber, qui dicitur Psalterium decem chordarum, sit tertius liber ejusdem evangelii. Here we plainly recognize the titles of the three works of Joachim mentioned above, in a note on p. 221. With this agree also the following words of Thomas Aquinas: Hoc autem evangelium, de quo loquuntur (William of St. Amour and his party), est quoddam introductorium in libro [s] Joachim compositum, quod est ab ecclesia reprobatum, vel etiam ipsa doctrina Joachim, per quam, ut dicunt, evangelium Christi mutatur. See opusculum xvi, contra impugnantes religionem (the opponents of the mendicant orders). Opp. ed. Venet. t. xix, p. 415.

[2] De periculis novissimorum temporum, p. 38.

[3] I can not acquiesce in the conjecture of Dr. Engelhardt, that William of St. Amour here had in mind the doctrine of Almaric of Bena, but believe that he always had in view the doctrines of Joachim which had spread in the Franciscan order, or doctrines associated with Joachim's ideas, as appears evident when, after the words above cited, he adds: "Quod (evangelio aeterno) adveniente evacuabitur, ut dicunt, evangelium Christi, ut parati simus ostendere in illo evangelio maledicto. Here he assuredly means the same thing which in the place first cited from his sermons is called the gospel. And had he meant Almaric, who was condemned as a heretic, there was certainly no reason why he should omit to mention his name.

[4] L. c. p. 500.

certainly be regarded as evidence that a doctrine like that of Almaric, concerning a new religion of the perfect, close at hand, was even then taught among the strict Franciscans. It is easy to see, by referring back to the account given on a former page, of the doctrines of Joachim, how St. Amour might be led to suppose that he found all this in Joachim's writings, which surely he had read but superficially, and for the very reason that they were so highly esteemed among the Franciscans, with hostile feelings, as well as an entirely opposite bent of mind. And since the existing form of the church constitution seemed to him in exact accordance with the essence of Christianity, he could not fail, indeed, where Joachim predicted some new form of the manifestation of Christianity, in which it was to cast aside its present confined envelope, to see therein announced some new antichristian gospel. Taking everything together which the opponents cite from the "Introductory to the eternal gospel," it may well be doubted whether, even in this book, any such doctrine, implying the destruction of Christianity, was set forth. The whole matter of this work also seems to have consisted in an explication of the fundamental ideas of the abbot Joachim, and in the application of them to the genuine Franciscan order. The condemnation of the "Introductory," by pope Alexander the Fourth, could not put a stop, however, to the circulation of these ideas. They still continued to be cherished among the party of the more rigid Franciscans, and a remarkable individual, who sprung up in the midst of that body, gave them a new impulse.

This was John Peter de Oliva of Provence, who from his twelfth year had been educated in the Franciscan order.[1] He was governed from the first by that eccentric tendency of religious feeling and imagination which had gone forth from Francis; as was seen, for example, in his extravagant eulogiums of the Virgin Mary, which, indeed, were found to be offensive even in his own order;[2] but with this, he united a profound, speculative intellect. A mixture of profound ideas and fantastic, whimsical assertions might naturally be expected, therefore, in his writings.[3] Zealous for the primitive severity of the Franciscan rule, he inveighed against all deviations from it; and the same spirit led him also to attack the worldly life, the luxury and pomp of the clergy. By so doing he created many enemies, who eagerly laid hold of every occasion presented by his many singular, bold remarks, to suggest suspicions with regard to his orthodoxy.[4] Besides his doctrine of evangelical poverty, various metaphysical, dogmatic statements were hazarded by him, which gave offence. Among these was the opinion that Christ when struck by the spear in his side was not yet dead.[5] After an assembly of the Franciscan order, convened in the year 1282, had ordered an investigation of his doctrines, and of their spread, he

[1] See Wadding. Annales, 1289, N. 29.

[2] In Wadding. l. c. N. 28.

[3] We have to lament that nothing has as yet been published from the writings of this remarkable man. We know nothing of him except from the articles declared heretical, which had been extracted from his Commentary on the Apocalypse, by a papal commission under John the Twenty Second. In Baluz. Miscellan. i, f. 213.

[4] Wadding. Annales, at the year 1282 N. 2.

[5] L. c. at the year 1297. N. 37, etc.

submitted, in the year following, to the recantation prescribed to him,[1] and at a convention of the order held at Paris, in 1292, he gave them entire satisfaction by the explanations which he laid before them. His opponents were no match for him in dialectics. He died at the age of fifty, in 1297. Before his death he laid down a confession, in which he unconditionally submitted to the decisions of the church of Rome. Yet he reserved to himself the liberty of refusing to follow any human determination claiming to decide that anything belonged to the essence of the faith, unless it were the decision of the pope, or of a general council; except in so far as he was enforced to adopt it by reason, or the authority of the Holy Scriptures, or the essence of the Catholic faith itself. He held it, moreover, to be a salutary thing that opposite opinions should be set forth and defended, provided it were done without obstinacy,— for so, the truth would be more accurately investigated, the minds of disputants more exercised, and men more certainly led to an understanding of the doctrines of faith.[2]

Oliva distinguished seven ages of the church: The first, its foundation by the apostles; the second, its preservation by the sufferings of the martyrs; the third, the evolution and defence of the faith in the contests with heretics; the fourth, the period of the anchorites living in strict self-mortification, who poured a bright light on the church by their example; the fifth, the period of the common life of monks and clerks, some of whom practised greater severity, others accommodated themselves to the ordinary mode of living; the sixth, the renewal of the evangelical and the extirpation of the antichristian life, with which is connected the final conversion of the Jews and pagans, or at once the reconstruction of the primitive church; the seventh age is, in its relation to this earthly life, a sort of sabbath; a peaceful and miraculous participation in future blessedness, as if the heavenly Jerusalem had descended upon earth; — but in its relation to the future life, it is the general resurrection, the glorification of the saints, and the end of all things. This distinction of a twofold design of the great epochs in the evolution of the kingdom of God, according to their point of departure and their point of termination, belongs among the peculiar features in the intuitions of Oliva. Thus, he says of the first period, that in one sense it may be supposed to begin with the preaching of Christ; in another, with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The second age began, in the proper sense, with Nero's persecution; but in a certain sense with the stoning of Stephen, or the passion of Christ. The sixth age began, in one sense, with the time of St. Francis, but more perfectly with the judgments executed on a corrupt church. He distinguishes, furthermore, a threefold manifestation of Christ in the history of the world: the first and last, visible; the middle one not sensible, but spiritual. The first, for the redemption of the world, and the founding of the church; the second, to renew the latter to the spirit of the evangelical life, and carry forward the church, already founded, to perfection; the third, for judgment, for the glorifica-

[1] L. c. at the year 1283. N. 7. [2] Wadding. Annales, at the year 1297. N. 34.

tion of the elect, and for the general consummation. Although this spiritual advent of Christ must be referred to the *whole* process of development of the church, and also to the glorification of the saints, yet it may, in a certain sense, be preëminently attributed to the sixth period, whose characteristics are founded on this very interior activity of the spirit of Christ.[1] He supposes a progressive evolution of the antichristian and the Christian principles, both proceeding side by side, to the last decisive struggle; so that each successive period takes up into itself all the good and evil of the preceding one, and hence all the good and evil of all earlier periods must be concentrated in the last time of the spiritual revelation of Christ, and of the manifestation of antichrist. "Just as the virtue of the root and of the stalk," says he, "lives again in the branches and the fruit, so whatever disturbs the healthy development of life also transmits itself.[2] And as the whole virtue and force of the earlier times, therefore, strives towards the great end, of producing the sixth and the seventh period, so all the opposite evil of the earlier times will ally itself with the malice of antichrist, and of the others, by whom the elect of the sixth and seventh periods are to be tempted.[3] The sixth period will, therefore, be distinctly and prominently marked above all the preceding ones, as the goal to which everything presses, — the commencement of a new age of the world, whereby the old world will be done away, just as by the appearance of Christ the Old Testament, and the old life of mankind, were done away.[4] As by Christ's first appearance an end was put to the old synagogue and a new church was erected, so by his spiritual advent all old things will be taken out of the way, and the church recreated, as it were, into an entirely new one. As the spiritual revelation of Christ goes through all the ages of the church, but must be preëminently ascribed to that sixth age, the same is to be said also of the agency of the Holy Spirit; and precisely by this fact the third age of the world, beginning with the sixth period of the church, is distinguished as the age of the Holy Spirit from the two earlier, the time of the Old Testament and the Christian period which has thus far elapsed.[5]

It is manifest, from this collation of passages, how far Oliva was from favoring the theory which taught that Christianity itself was to be annulled by this new revelation of the Holy Ghost. He looks upon the whole as only a progressive, organic evolution of Christianity itself, through different *stadia*, starting from that which Christ has done once for all. The aim of the entire evolution is nothing other than the com-

[1] Licet autem secundus adventus sit in toto decursu ecclesiae et etiam in glorificatione sanctorum, nihilominus recte et congrue per quandam antonomasiam appropriatur tempori sexto.

[2] Sicut virtus radicis et stipitis redivivit in ramo et fructu, sic et infectio utriusque.

[3] Sicut tota virtus priorum temporum intendit generationem sexti et septimi status, sic tota malitia iis opposita coöverabitur malitiae antichristi et reliquorum exercentium electos sexti et septimi status.

[4] Initium novi seculi, evacuans quoddam vetus seculum, sicut status Christi evacuavit vetus testamentum et vetustatem humani generis.

[5] Tertius status mundi sub sexto statu ecclesiae inchoandus et spiritui sancto per quandam antonomasiam appropriandus.

plete exhibition of the image of Christ, according to life and knowledge, in humanity; which coincides with the true realization of the image of God, and of man's destined dominion over the world. So too the sixth day, on which man was created in the image of God, corresponds to the sixth period, in which the mass of the Jews and pagans will be restored to the image of God by Christianity.[1]

And here we should not fail to notice, that as Oliva did not possess a correct view of the apostolical church, nor a clear consciousness of the distinction between the Catholic point of view and primitive Christianity, so his view of the great end towards which the church in its progressive advancement is striving, must of course be affected thereby. Complete estrangement from the world, as contradistinguished from the hitherto prevailing absorption in the world; the religion of intuition and feeling, as opposed to the hitherto conceptual theology; pure passivity, in the surrendry of one's self to the godlike, as opposed to the hitherto prevailing self-activity of the intellect in the dialectical theology,— this, as it appeared to him, would form the distinguishing characteristic of that glorious period: "As it was the striving of the fathers in the first age of the world before Christ," says he, "to proclaim the great works of the Lord from the creation of the world, and as the children of God, in the second age of the world, from Christ onwards, labored to explore the hidden wisdom, so nothing else remains for the third age, but that we should sing God's praise,— while we magnify his great power and his manifold wisdom and goodness, which are clearly revealed in his works and in the word of the Sacred Scriptures; for while in the first age of the world, God the Father manifested himself as the terrible God, and a being to be feared; in the second age of the world, the Son manifested himself as a teacher and revealer, the Word of divine wisdom; he will reveal himself in the third age, of the Holy Ghost, as the flame of divine love and the fulness of all spiritual joy,— so that all the wisdom of the incarnate Word, and all the power of the Father, will not merely be known, but also felt and experienced."[2] To this he applies the promise, given by Christ, of the Holy Spirit, which should lead to all truth, and glorify him; — which, therefore, he applies also, in a preëminent sense, to this sixth period: "As, in the first times, the world was converted to Christ by extraordinary and countless miracles, so it is behooving that it should, in the last times, again be converted by a peculiar light of divine wisdom, and of the understanding of the Scriptures; especially, since the condition of this period is to be of so elevated a character as to admit of the reception and contemplation of the divine light itself."[3] This sixth period, then, stands prominent, indeed, above all the other

[1] Bestiae sexto die formatae, post quas formatus est homo ad imaginem Dei, quia post has convertetur Israël cum reliquiis gentium et apparebit Christiformis vita et imago Christi.

[2] Non solum simplici intelligentia, sed etiam gustativa et palpativa experientia videbitur omnis veritas sapientiae verbi Dei incarnati et potentia Dei patris.

[3] Sicut primo tempore conversus est mundus ad Christum per stupendas, et innumerabiles virtutes miraculorum, sic decet, quod in finali tempore convertatur iterum orbis per praeclara et superadmiranda

and earlier ones, by the plenitude of grace and familiar tokens of Christ's love; yet it has the more reason to humble itself, because, what distinguishes it consists much rather in passivity, or receiving, than in activity, or giving; much rather in that blessedness, which is a reward, than in that pains-taking service, which might pass for a desert. As the glory which was intended for the synagogue and its priests, had they believed in Christ, was transferred to the primitive church and its shepherds; so also the glory intended for the church of the fifth period will, on account of its apostasy, be transferred to the elect of the sixth period. The precursor of the new period of genuine life, which consists in following Christ in evangelical poverty, is St. Francis; he who first exhibited, in this respect, the perfect image of Christ, who must resemble Christ therefore in all respects, and hence must bear also the prints of his wounds.[1] When David was anointed, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, Saul was left more than ever to himself, and the evil spirit took possession of him; so when the Spirit of God was evidently transferred to the evangelical paupers (the genuine, strict Franciscans), and they were called and consecrated by him to the office of preaching, many began to be stirred with a diabolical spirit against them, while they sunk deeper and deeper themselves into simony, cupidity, luxury, and worldly pomp. The *extensive* increase of the church should be conditioned on its *intensive* power,— from the interior glory of the church, in the period of the Holy Ghost, should proceed also its external enlargement. They who exhibited the perfect image of Christ in evangelical poverty, should be employed as the instruments for the extension of God's kingdom through the whole world."

"But as, in the apostolic times, the preaching of the gospel found more acceptance among the heathen than among the Jews; so, too, the new evangelical missionaries would find greater success among the Greeks, Saracens, Tartars, and finally the Jews, than in the fleshly church of the Latins." The Babylon of Revelation is uniformly represented by Oliva as the corrupt church of Rome, hurrying to the judgment; and he describes her corruption in the plainest terms. "She is Babylon, the great whore, because wickedness thrives and spreads in her, not only intensively but extensively; so that the good in her are like a few grains of gold in a vast sand-heap; and as the Jews in Babylon were captives, and grievously oppressed, so will the spirit of the righteous, in this period, be oppressed and afflicted beyond endurance, by the countless host of a fleshly church, which they are enforced to serve against their will. The Babylon which stood in heathendom, made all men drunk with her idolatries; so that Babylon, which is the fleshly church, has made herself and all the people in subjection to her drunk, and led them astray by her shameful carnalities, simony, and worldly pomp. And as, previous to her fall, her malice and her power

et superabundantia lumina sapientiae Dei et scripturarum suarum, et maxime quia oportet statum illius temporis elevari et introire ad ipsa lumina suscipienda et contemplanda.

[1] See above, p. 276.

grievously oppressed the spirit of the elect, and hindered the conversion of the world, so will her overthrow be to the saints as a release from their captivity." "The seat of corruption," he says, "is more especially in the fleshly clergy, who hold the high places of Babylon; there it exists to a far greater extent than in the communities under them."[1]

Oliva agrees with the abbot Joachim, also, in that he describes the period of the Holy Ghost as being, at the same time, the Johannean period. To him, also, John stands as the representative of the contemplative bent, and of the new evangelical mode of life, the prototype of the *ordo evangelicus*. So he expounds Rev. 10: 10 in the sense that, by the new evangelical order, the work first commenced by the apostles shall be completed, and the mass of the pagans and Jews converted to Christianity.[2] The twelve gates of the kingdom of God, mentioned in Rev. 21: 12, he applies more particularly to the great teachers of this last period, by whose means the kingdom of God was to be extended among the pagans and Jews;[3] for, as it belonged more properly to the apostles to build, under Christ, the foundation of the whole church and of the Christian faith, so it belongs more properly to these to stand as the open gates; as those by whom the Christian wisdom is opened and explained;[4] for as a tree, so long as it subsists only in its root, cannot as yet unfold its whole peculiar nature, and let every part of it be seen, which can only be done when, in its branches, leaves, blossoms, and fruit, it has reached its complete development; so the tree or building of the church, and of the divine wisdom which shines forth in its different parts after manifold ways, neither could nor should unfold itself from the beginning, as it can and must do in its perfection.[5] As the course of development marked by the Old, supposes a gradual progression, so does the process of the development of Christian wisdom, on the foundation of the New Testament."[6]

It is plain that, notwithstanding the wild and singular notions which are mixed in with his more profound ideas, we may reckon Oliva as belonging, with the abbot Joachim, among the prophetic men who bore within them the germs of great spiritual developments in the future,

[1] In quo bestialis vita singulariter regnat et sedet sicut in sua principali sede et longe plus quam in laïcis et plebibus sibi subjectis.

[2] Ut per ipsum Joannem designatur in communi ordo evangelicus et contemplativus, scitur ex ipsa intelligentia libri, quod per istum ordinem debet hoc impleri.

[3] Licet per Apostolos et per alios Sanctos secundi generalis status intraverit multitudo populorum ad Christum tanquam per portas civitatis Dei, nihilominus magis appropriate competit hoc principalibus doctoribus tertii generalis status.

[4] Sicut enim apostolis magis competit esse cum Christo fundamenta totius ecclesiae et fidei Christianae, sic istis plus competit, esse portas apertas et apertores seu explicatores sapientiae Christianae.

[5] Sicut arbor, dum est in sola radice, non potest sic tota omnibus explicari seu explicite monstrari, sicut quando est in ramis et foliis et fructibus consummata, sic arbor seu fabrica ecclesiae et divinae providentiae ac sapientiae in ejus partibus diversimode refulgentis et participatae non sic potuit nec debuit ab initio explicari sicut in sua consummatione poterit et debebit.

[6] Sicut ab initio mundi usque ad Christum crevit successive illuminatio populi Dei et explicatio ordinis et processus totius veteris testamenti et providentiae Dei in fabricatione et gubernatione, sic est et de illuminationibus et explicationibus Christianae sapientiae in statu novi testamenti.

though intermingled with a chaotic mass of heterogeneous elements. His ideas relative to the process of the development of revelation and of the church, were incapable of being shaped out and applied, except by the calm, scientific insight of a distant futurity. In his own times, however, it was the imaginative element in the writings of Oliva, and that part of them which touched on the favorite ideas of the strict Franciscans and other zealous defendants of an evangelical poverty, such as were found among the people called Beghards,[1] which promoted their circulation. The magisterial decree of the superiors of his order, against Oliva's writings,[2] could not hinder their influence. We shall perceive the after-workings of them in the succeeding periods.

Among those in whom the power of those ideas expressed by the abbot Joachim, and which filled the spiritual atmosphere, is plainly seen, we should notice, in this connection, the Italian *Apostolicals*. Though the history of this party reaches into the following period, yet we think it proper to take up the whole matter in the present connection, because their commencement belongs in this period, and their history is very closely inwoven with those kindred manifestations, which we have been contemplating in this section. We shall first have to consider these Italian Apostolicals as one of the many forms of manifestation of that idea, which we saw springing up under so many different shapes, from Arnold of Brescia and onwards. Their first founder was Gerhard Segarelli of Parma.[3] Born in the village of Alzano, in the province of Parma,[4] he had settled down in that city, where he pursued some sort of a trade. Disgusted with the common pursuits of the world, and awakened to an earnest desire after a more serious and hearty Christian life, he felt impelled, like so many other pious men of his times, to follow the pattern of the apostles in a total renunciation of earthly interests. Hoping to find such an apostolical community in the Franciscan order, he expressed a desire to enter this order. But his reception into it was for some cause or other delayed. While pursuing his daily practice of abandoning himself to devotional meditations before a picture in the Franciscan church, representing the apostles in the coarse garments and slippers usually assigned to them in this period,[5] he became more and more fixed in the resolution to found an apostolical community, which should labor for nothing else but the conversion of men. That form of the apostolical community which he found in the Franciscan order no longer satisfied him. It was a freer

[1] See above, p. 303.

[2] See Wadding. Annales, at the year 1297. N. 35.

[3] The history of his life was more fully given in the Chronicle composed by the Franciscan Salimbenus de Adam, belonging to this time. This has not yet been published; but extracts from it, which relate to the history of Segarelli, are said to have been communicated by the Italian jurist Francesco Pegna, in his remarks on the Directorium Inquisitionis of Nicholas Eymericus, f. 271, ed. Venet. 1595. I follow, here, the quotations of Mosheim; for, in the Roman edition of 1585, lying before me, I do not find this piece.

[4] The Chronicle of Parma, published by Muratori. in the 9th vol. of the Scriptores rerum Italicarum, p. 826.

[5] In the extracts from Salimbeno's Chronicle: Super coopertorium lampadis depicti erant apostoli circumcirca cum soleis in pedibus et cum mantellis circa scapulas involuti, sicut traditio pictorum ab antiquis accepit, — ubi iste contemplatur.

union, which his mind demanded; a union not held together by any vow, rule, or law, but a union of brethren actuated solely by the free spirit of love. So, in the year 1260, suiting his dress to the style in which the apostles were represented, he went forth as a preacher of repentance, and gradually a number of others joined him. As he and his companions were in the habit of commencing their sermons with the Ave Maria, the recitation of the Apostles' creed, and the Lord's prayer, and as the substance of their discourses was altogether practical, as they entered into no discussions of the church doctrines, perhaps were not conscious of any opposition to them, they went on for a long time unmolested; for the appearance of such itinerant preachers of repentance was nothing extraordinary; and, moreover, the political disturbances which then agitated Italy, diverted public attention from such singularities. Thus it was in the power of this society of apostolical brethren to propagate themselves for twenty years, and also to extend themselves beyond the limits of Italy. At length, however, the rapid increase of the sect excited the suspicion of the bishop of Parma, and he had Gerhard arrested and confined. Yet he could find nothing in him that was heretical; but looked upon him, as he might well do, from the many singularities in his conduct, as a crazy fanatic, not deserving of punishment, but needing only to be watched;[1] and he bestowed every attention upon him in his palace, till, growing tired of him, he set him at liberty in 1286. He banished him, however, from the city of Parma and from the entire diocese. Yet pope Honorius the Fourth, in the same year, found it necessary to issue a bull, addressed to all bishops, and calling upon them to suppress all those spiritual societies existing without papal confirmation, whose members went about begging, to the great peril of their own souls, and the grievous scandal of many in different countries of the world. True, it must already have been perceived that such modes of life were employed by numbers for the dissemination of heretical doctrines;[2] yet no indication is to be found in the papal document that any such society had, on the whole, drawn upon itself the suspicion of an heretical tendency. On the contrary, it is presupposed that they were, on the whole, devoted to the Catholic church; it was simply required of them that, in order to preclude the dangers to which they exposed themselves and others, they must, if they wished to continue such a mode of life, attach themselves to some existing order of mendicant friars. Neither is it clear that the ordinance was directed against Segarelli's society in particular, which is not indicated in any way. There were, in fact, a number of such communities, which had arisen among the laity in different countries; and so the pope renewed the ordinance which

[1] When, afterwards, the heretical tendency of the Apostolicals came to light, men would, of course, no longer be satisfied with this mild declaration. We must interpret in this sense, that the heretic, who resorted to every species of falsehood and deceit to gain his end, feigned madness for the purpose of escaping deserved punishment, as Salimbeno says: Amentiam finxit ideoque carcere eductus. But such cunning and dissimulation were certainly altogether inconsistent with the natural disposition of this man.

[2] As it is said: Cum nonnulli pravitatis haereticae vitio laborantes sub hujusmodi habitu asserantur inventi.

Gregory the Tenth, in the twenty-third canon of the council of Lyons, in 1274, had issued against communities of "mendicants," not standing under papal confirmation. But then if the ordinance was not expressly directed against *this* spiritual society, it could not fail to have a very serious effect on its prosperity. The inquisitorial measures of the church authorities would, by virtue of it, be called forth against all such combinations.[1] This freer reaction of the Christian spirit, extending under so many various forms among the laity, could not thus be suppressed. Pope Nicholas the Fourth was obliged, four years later, in 1290, to issue another circular letter against the Apostolicals, couched in terms similar to the first;[2] which shows how little had been effected by the first.[3] The Italian Apostolicals, who refused to abandon their vocation, which they believed to be from God, were only driven thereby to a more violent opposition to the papacy and the dominant church. They stood forth against it as a worldly and corrupt church, and began to describe it as the Babylon of the Apocalypse. They were now persecuted as opponents of the church, and heretics. Many died at the stake: Segarelli himself, having ventured to show

[1] At the council of Würzburg, A. D. 1287, the 34th canon was enacted against it: Leccatores sive reprobatos apostolos in eorum reprobata regula remanere vetantes omnino volumus, quod nullus clericus, nulla saecularis persona intuitu religionis eorum ac insolito habitu eos de caetero recipiat aut eis alimenta ministret. It cannot, however, as Mosheim supposes, be certainly proved from this ordinance that the Apostolicals, originating with Segarelli, had already spread as far as Germany; for as such communities everywhere abounded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and particularly in Germany, and as it is simply the mark common to all such societies which is here mentioned; so there is nothing to warrant us to fix upon the Segarellian community rather than any other. At the council of Chichester, in 1289, the thirty-ninth canon was passed against such as, professing themselves members of some apostolical society, preached, heard confessions, and, pretending that they were in want of books, of a sacramental chalice, or of some other church-utensil, collected money and deceived the people: Quidam non veri fratres, nec veraciter quidem de ordine Apostolorum existentes Apostolorum habitum et tonsuram portantes, in plerisque ecclesiis et aliis locis nostrae dioecesis praedicationis et audiendi confessionem officium praesumptuose exercuerunt et aliquoties eorum praedicationem ad quaestum pecuniarium et aliud lucrum turpe florido colore subventionis ad calicem vel librum vel aliud ornamentum ecclesiasticum, quos eos egere asserunt, converterunt, etc. See Wilkins, Concil. Brit. t. ii, f. 172. Mosheim acknowledges that marks here occur which cannot apply to the Segarellian apostolicals. Why ought we not, then, to refer this ordinance of the German, as well as that of the English council, to all such societies of Apostolicals, or Beghards, among whom, as among the proper monks, there were men of very different religious and moral characters, without any particular reference to the Italian Apostolicals? When these are described, in the first passage, as leccatores (voluptuaries), this designation may have been deserved by many who used the pretended apostolical mode of life only as a hypocritical mask, and wrongly applied to others by the heresy-hating spirit.

[2] As we may conclude from the report of Nicholas Eymericus, l. c. f. 288, ed Rom. 1585.

[3] The author of the Additamentum ad historiam Dolcini, in Muratori's Scriptores rerum Italicarum, t. ix, f. 448, who wrote in the year 1316, says the contrary, it is true, of the effect of that first papal document: Post praedictas literas apostolicas dicta secta perniciosa coepit dejici paulatim et a fidelibus evitari; but what he himself reports, in the sequel, sufficiently proves that we are not to regard the effect as having been very great; and a limitation indeed is implied in the word paulatim. But when the author says that the sect could not be wholly suppressed, quia longe lateque in diversis mundi partibus se diffuderat, the question arises whether he was not under another mistake, in identifying with the sect of Segarelli all the different branches of the Apostolicals, which had started from the same idea with that sect, but outwardly had no sort of connection with it.

himself once more within the diocese of Parma, was, in 1294, thrown into prison. By consenting to make a recantation of the erroneous doctrines imputed to him, he escaped the stake, but was condemned to perpetual confinement.[1] The inquisitors, however, managed to find out that they had been deceived by him, and that he was still given to the same erroneous doctrines as before, and so he was condemned, as one who had relapsed into heresy, to the stake, and died in the year 1300.

With the death of their first founder this sect was by no means broken up. It was connected with a spiritual excitement growing out of the prevailing temper of those times, in which the individual Segarelli, a man of no great force of personal character, was of subordinate importance; and there stood already at the head of the Apostolical community, a man altogether superior to Segarelli, in mind, education, and practical efficiency, who had joined him at some earlier period. This was Dolcino,[2] the natural son of a priest, in a village belonging to the diocese of Novara;[3] he was destined for the spiritual order, and educated with a view to it. He obtained the requisite literary qualifications, and distinguished himself by the quickness of his parts and the rapid development of his intellectual powers, as well as by the winning kindliness of his natural disposition.[4] If we could trust a story from a good source, though not wholly free from all liability to suspicion,[5] Dolcino did not from his youth upward maintain a character

[1] Addit. ad hist. Dolcini, l. c. f. 450, and Chronicon Parmense, l. c. f. 826.

[2] The principal sources are the Historia Dolcini and the Additamenta ad historiam Dolcini in Muratori's scriptores rerum Italicarum, t. ix. I learn from the work of Julius Krone, published this year: "Frà Dolcino and the Patarenes," that Christofora Baggiolini, professor at Vercelli, in a work entitled Dolcino e i Patareni notizie storiche, Novara, 1838, has published from the archives of Vercelli, some new documents on Dolcino's history, which frequently contradict those published by Muratori. Respecting the value of these new documents as bearing on the right apprehension of Dolcino, I cannot decide, because I have never seen them. But, however disputable some things may be in the history of Dolcino, yet at any rate, the comparison of the appearance of this man with kindred appearances, in which connection we have endeavored to seize it, presents, on the whole, a picture of decided and well-marked outlines.

[3] According to the sources early published, Trontano, in the upper Val d'Ossola; according to the documents in Baggiolini, Prato in the diocese of Vercelli, between Grignasco and Romagnano. The work of Krone, p. 27.

[4] We are indebted for these statements to Benvenuto of Imola, who, in the fourteenth century, wrote a commentary on the Divina Commedia of Dante, from which Muratori has published extracts in his Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi, t. i, folio edition. This Benvenuto had his information from the mouth of the grandson of a physician, Raynald de Bergamo, who was Dolcino's physician. He says of him Erat acutissimi ingenii iste Dulcinus, ita quod in brevi factus est optimus scholaris; quum esset parvae staturae, facie laetus, omnibus gratus. L. c. f. 1122.

[5] It is the source just cited. The particular circumstances in the story may have served to give it currency: Surripuit furto sacerdoti praefato certam pecuniae summam, quia nimis fidebat ei. Ideo, ut saepe accidit, sacerdos imputabat hoc furtum cuidam familiari suo, cui nomen erat Patras. Qui moleste ferens injustam infamiam, clandestine Dulcinum captum compulit terrore privatae torturae ad confessionem furti et iratus juste volebat ducere Dulcinum ad publicum supplicium. Sed sacerdos prohibuit, ne fieret irregularis. Dulcinus autem territus secessit inscio sacerdote et contulit se ad ultrema Italiae ad civitatem Tridenti. But we know how easily rumors arise to the disadvantage of persons decried as heretics, and how especially inclined men ever are to trace the origin of their heretical tendencies to wicked motives. Now of Dolcino's early boyhood and youth, nothing had been heard but what was good. But on the presupposition that the heretic must have been a bad man from the beginning, all

quite pure from all stain. He is said to have purloined a sum of money from the ecclesiastic who managed his education, and who reposed the utmost confidence in him; and to escape the threatened punishment, when he was compelled to confess his guilt, he fled to the districts of Trent, in the Tyrol. If this account is strictly true; if Dolcino, on the contrary, full already of his reformatory ideas, suggested to him perhaps by the representation of the apostolical life in his Latin New Testament, as contrasted with the corruption of the clergy of his times, did not betake himself to the districts of the Tyrol for the sake of spreading these ideas more easily and safely, we are left without the means of reconciling the Dolcino who was capable of committing the crime above mentioned, with the Dolcino who appears in the character of a reformer and Apostolical. It remains in fact a psychological enigma, how there should have arisen in the mind of one who robbed his benefactor of money to gratify his lusts, an enthusiasm for the ideal of an apostolical community of goods; how such an one could have been carried away by zeal against the corruption of the worldly-minded clergy. This is a self-contradiction, which must render the whole story suspicious to us.[1] Only two suppositions remain to solve this contradiction. Either that a great change had transpired in the religious and moral life of Dolcino, and to this was to be traced the opposition he manifested against the corruption of the church of his times, or that there was some intrinsic connection between his want of respect for another's property in his early youth, and the tendency which later in life caused him to appear as a zealot for the community of goods, — certainly a very improbable supposition.

But however this may have been, the districts of Tyrol were the first field of Dolcino's activity as a reformer; and here he might easily have come in contact with anti-churchly tendencies, which had been spread there ever since the time of Arnold of Brescia. Here he appeared at first as a zealot against the corruption of the clergy living in pomp and luxury; and as he himself went in coarse apparel, like the so-called Beghards, Humiliates, so he was for setting up a society in opposition to the clergy, composed of those who were willing to make a total renunciation of the world, and live without any property whatever.[2] Driven from this place by persecutions, he betook himself to

his good qualities could only be pretended; wickedness must have been concealed under the mask of virtue, and would some time or other make itself manifest. (Thus Benvenuto, reporting what was good of him, adds: sed non diu occultavit pravitatem, quae latebat sub egregia indole.) If, perhaps, when a young man, animated with a zeal for reform, he betook himself to Tyrol, for the purpose of winning over to his views the simple mountaineers, then this first step of his heretical career must be directly traced to something bad. He wanted to escape deserved punishment, and as he afterwards introduced the apostolical community of goods, so it naturally occurred to represent his first transgression as one in which he was led to disregard the rights of property. Accidental circumstances may have furnished the occasion for such a setting forth of the story. I would only hint a possible doubt, not decide.

[1] Against its credibility is the fact also, that these writers, belonging to a place and period which breathed nothing but hostility to Dolcino, of whom they are eager to say everything bad, still mention nothing of this sort, which they gladly would have done if it had been true, for the purpose of showing that the hidden root of his heresy was covetousness.

[2] So says Benvenuto: Ibi in montibus

those districts where the apostolical society of Segarelli was established, joined it, and after the death of Segarelli, became the leader of the party. He travelled about Italy, seeking opportunities to extend his sect; but everywhere dogged by the Inquisitors, he was obliged to flee from city to city. Thrice he fell into the hands of the Inquisition, but so managed his part as to deceive the judges, and gain his liberty.[1] According to the original principles of the Apostolicals, all Christ's commands should be observed to the letter; and so every attestation was to be a simple yea or nay.[2] But the strictness of these principles must in this case have yielded, or the interpretation of them accommodated itself to the force of circumstances. As Dolcino denied the competency of that ecclesiastical tribunal, or the right of any mere human authority to call others to an account for their religious convictions, so he seems to have considered it allowable to deceive by an oath those judges who arrogated to themselves a lordship over the conscience which did not belong to them. The verbal answer might be given in one way, the convictions of the heart held in another. So long as a man could save his life by such prevarication, the end would sanctify the means,[3] — a principle which Dolcino undoubtedly applied in other cases where the circumstances seemed to require it.

At length he retired to Dalmatia, a safer spot. From thence he issued a circular letter to the brethren scattered through all countries, and directed also to Christians generally. He claimed for himself a divine mission, having respect not barely to a particular community, but to entire Christendom, to announce to all the judgment impending over the corrupt church, to present before all the pattern of the resuscitated apostolical life, since the entire purified church was to pass over into this apostolical brotherly community. This letter began with the confession of his orthodoxy, which his opponents pronounced a mere pretence. He then described the nature of the new Christian community, by which the perfection of the apostolic life was to be restored, a union without the outward vow of obedience, preserved only by the inward bond of love.[4] This fellowship, he declares, had been specially sent and chosen in these last days of the world, by God, the Father, for the salvation of souls. He, the brother Dolcino, as he styled himself, had been specially called and chosen by God, with revelations communicated to him respecting present and future events, which furnished a key for the understanding of the Old and New Testament. He calls Gerhard Segarelli the founder of this last reformation of the Christian life, and himself the divinely commissioned leader of the new

illis inter gentes rudes et credulas coepit fundare novam sectam in habitu fratricelli sine ordine, praedicans se verum Dei apostolum et quod omnia debebant communicari in caritate.

[1] He confessed this at his last trial. See the Historia Dolcini in Muratori, t. ix. f. 436.

[2] See in the protocol of the Inquisition at Toulouse, published by Philip of Limborch, f. 361, the declaration of an Apostolical with regard to oaths. He says to the inquisitor: Quod caveret sibi, quod non peccaret, faciendo ipsum jurare, quia in evangelio Deus prohibuerat jurare.

[3] See the Additamentum in Muratori, f. 457, n. 20.

[4] Congregationem suam spiritualem esse et propriam in proprio modo vivendi apostolico et proprio nomine cum paupertate propria et sine vinculo obedientiae exteriori, sed cum interiori tantum.

spiritual community, to qualify him for which office, the understanding of the prophecies in the Bible had been revealed to him.[1] He presented his intuitions of the onward movement of the church, of her increasing conflicts till the appearance of antichrist, and of her triumph, for which the way was to be prepared by the Apostolicals. He expressed himself throughout in the tone of a prophet. Anticipating, he said, the impending judgments of God, he had hidden himself and fled from the presence of his persecutors, as his predecessors had done, till God's appointed time, when all his adversaries were to be destroyed, and he and his would come forth and preach openly.[2] All their persecutors, all the prelates of the church, were in a short time to be exterminated; those that remained would be converted, and adopt the apostolical mode of living. The Apostolicals would then gain the preponderance in all matters. He subsequently wrote a second and a third letter of the same general import.[3]

Many things in the circumstances of the times, — the appearance of a pope possessed of a spirit so much akin to that of the Apostolicals, and who stood in so strong a contrast with his predecessors, as Celestin the Fifth; the secular drift and policy of Boniface the Eighth, his contests and final humiliation, might appear as a confirmation of Dolcino's predictions. Where the issue plainly contradicted them, he still might not allow himself to be nonplussed, and would only have to give them a different interpretation.

Dolcino had determined to await the final crisis in Dalmatia, where he had founded a small community; but by the invitation of a wealthy landholder of his native country, Milano Sola, in the Valley of Sessia, near Campertolio, in the Province of Novara, he was induced, in the year 1304, to take refuge in that place, and from thence he extended his sect amongst men and women. Numbers flocked to him from all quarters. The attempts to waylay him led him to flee for security, with a band of adherents, amounting to two thousand men and women, to an inaccessible mountain. But here, though safe from other enemies, they were exposed to perish by famine. As none would willingly supply them with the means of subsistence, they took the liberty to obtain it by force from the surrounding country. The Apostolicals, who accused the dominant church of apostasy from the doctrine of Christ on account of the persecutions which they practised, who condemned all shedding of blood as unchristian, and were for committing everything to the judgment of God, were forced by necessity to depart from their own principles. Dolcino once more let down his theory to the exigencies of practice. The Apostolicals looked upon their relation to the adherents of the dominant church as one of open war. The end of self-preservation must again sanction the means. In the

[1] Gerardum inceptorem istius vitae novissimae reformatae, et rectorem alium, scilicet seipsum, a Deo missum super congregationem praedictam cum intelligentia ad aperiendas prophetias.

[2] Usque ad tempus praefinitum, in quo ipse et sui publice apparebunt et publice praedicabunt, omnibus suis adversariis exterminatis.

[3] From the first two extracts in the Additamentis ad historiam Dolcini.

year 1305, a crusade was proclaimed against Dolcino. With consummate skill he directed for two years the measures of defence against a superior force, and was able to inspire his friends with an enthusiastic courage, which surmounted every difficulty till the year 1307, when the remnant of the famished Apostolicals, after fighting with desperate bravery, surrendered to the superior force of their enemies.[1] One of the captives was Dolcino, who, under the most cruel tortures which fanaticism and a thirst for vengeance could devise, manifested a steady calmness, which filled even his enemies with astonishment, though we can hardly doubt that it was rather the stoicism of the intoxicated enthusiast, than the calm submission of the sober, genuinely Christian martyr, with his eye fixed in the full consciousness of human weakness on the image of his suffering Master.

In Dolcino, we see the climax of that ascetical view of Christian charity,[2] according to which it should manifest itself, not in the appropriation of all earthly means for the advancement of God's kingdom, but in the renunciation of every earthly advantage; not in the conciliation and subordination of the inequalities of condition flowing out of human relations, and necessary to the various development of man's nature, but in the total abnegation of those differences. In opposition to the worldliness of the church, he proposed an entire estrangement from the world by a fraternal association of love, in which all should be united together under a voluntary bond, independent of constraint and law, and with the repudiation of all property and all inequalities of condition. Connected with this view of love in the form of entire estrangement from the world, was his view of marriage, which he would have separated from all sensuous affections, substituting a purely spiritual fellowship between husband and wife in the place of marriage, reviving the ascetical fanaticism of the *Syneisactae*.[3] Such was the spiritual union in which he lived himself with the sister Margaret, whom, in the introduction to his letters, he called "the beloved above all others," (*prae caeteris sibi dilectissima.*) It was the most dangerous error in this fanatical drift. Sense thus despised, under the false persuasion of a superiority of the spirit over the flesh, would easily find occasions to manifest itself, and in a worse way than before This principle was to be carried to the point, that all mankind should

[1] It is foreign from our purpose to enter farther into the account of this remarkable war. We refer on this point to the more full investigation and description in the above-mentioned work of Krone.

[2] Krone (p. 35), following the documents published by Baggiolini, gives a peculiar account of Dolcino's doctrines, according to which they would resemble those of the later Beghards. But we must have these documents before us, in order to form any decided judgment with regard to their credibility. We do not venture, therefore, as yet, to follow this new view of the matter, but hold to the documents made known to us by Muratori, which, to be sure, do not contain a full representation of the doctrines of Dolcino, and indeed presuppose a great deal that is wanting. It is very true, the Spanish author, Alvarus Pelagius, who began to write his work, De planctu ecclesiae, at Avignon, when papal poenitentiary, A. D., 1330, says, lib. ii, f, 172, ed. 1517: Caput istius sectae spiritus libertatis istis temporibus fuit Dulchinus Lombardus qui fuit combustus cum quadam sua meretrice in Lombardia prope Vercellensem civitatem; but even he does not sufficiently distinguish the different kinds of Apostolicals, Beghards, and brothers of the free spirit.

[3] See vol. i, p. 277.

come to live together in perfect innocence as brothers and sisters, and this fellowship of love, renouncing every earthly feeling, was to form the transition-point to the end of all things and the fulfilment of the kingdom of Christ.

Dolcino distinguished four stages and divisions in the progress of the kingdom of God on the earth. First, the stage of the Old Testament, where, as all depended on the multiplication of the human race, everything was arranged with reference to this end. As at this stage corruption spread wider and wider, Christ with the apostles and their successors appeared, to heal the infirmities incident to the earlier condition. Humility, patience, poverty, chastity, were opposed to the corruption of the preceding stage. The unmarried life was now preferred before marriage, the renunciation of all possessions to the possession of earthly goods. This second stage lasted till the time of Constantine or pope Silvester, and the later generations gradually departed from the perfection of the preceding ones, till the third period appeared, when the multitudes of the heathen were converted in increasing numbers to Christianity. To train them by degrees for Christianity, and to show them how the things of earth should be used in the love of God and our neighbor, the church had now to assume earthly possessions and riches. She must make use of secular power, and rule in order to educate and guide the rude people. Hence, then, a departure was required from the original condition of apostolical poverty.[1] But when men grew cold in the love of God and their neighbors, when they departed from the example of Silvester and from the right use of earthly goods, the stricter rule of Benedict appeared as a reaction.[2] For a time, virtuous ecclesiastics and monks were to be found side by side; both forms of living were good, each in its place; save that in the case of the ecclesiastics, or the majority of them, the goodness went on diminishing, while in the case of the monks it went on increasing; the clerical life gradually lost its influence, and monachism continually gained the preponderance.[3] But when, again, both ecclesiastics and monks had almost entirely lost the love of God and their neighbors, and departed from their primitive mode of life, then, as a reaction against this state of things, came the renunciation of all earthly possessions and of all temporal lordship, in the rules of Francis and Dominick.[4] Still, even this reformation did not

[1] Dum sic convertebantur et non refrigerabantur in amore Dei et proximi, melius fuit sancto Silvestro papae et aliis successoribus suis possessiones terrenas et divitias suscipere et habere, quam paupertas apostolica et melius fuit regere populum, quam non regere, ad tenendum ipsum sic et conservandum.

[2] Quando incoeperunt populi refrigerari a caritate Dei et proximi et declinare a modo vivendi sancti Silvestri, tunc melior fuit modus vivendi beati Benedicti, quam aliquis alius, quia in terrenis fuit strictior et a temporali dominio magis separatus.

[3] Et tamen ita bonus erat tunc modus bonorum clericorum, qui tunc erant, sicut monachorum, nisi quod modus clericorum bonorum secundum majorem partem numeri eorum erat in diminuendo et monachorum erat in multiplicando.

[4] Quando clerici et monachi quasi ex toto a caritate Dei et proximi refrigerati fuerunt et declinaverunt a priori statu suo, tunc melior fuit modus vivendi sancti Francisci et sancti Dominici et magis strictus in possidendo res terrenas et in dominio temporali magis quam modus vivendi beati Benedicti et monachorum.

afford an adequate counterpoise to the extensive spread of corruption among the monks and ecclesiastics. All prelates, ecclesiastics, and monks waxed colder and colder in the love of God and of their neighbors, departed farther and farther from the way of life among their predecessors. For the purpose then of checking this tide of corruption, the life of the Apostolical brethren was instituted, by a divine call; and this is the fourth and last stage of the Christian life, which is to continue till the final judgment; the last defence against the encroaching torrent of worldliness. In like manner, Dolcino marked out the different periods of the church. The first, when the church was a holy and humble one; the second, from Silvester and onwards, when the church was honored and rich, but still persevered, however, in righteousness; the third, as she now is, rich and honored, but at the same time apostate from God, full of avarice, luxury, and pride;[1] the fourth corresponds to the first, as being the restoration of the Apostolical perfection.

The mode of life among the Apostolical brethren differs from that of the mendicant orders of monks in two respects. First, the latter have monasteries, to which they carry what they have gained by begging. The Apostolical brethren have no houses, and take nothing with them, hoard nothing up; they live from hand to mouth, on the pittance bestowed on them at the moment by the charity of the pious.[2] Secondly, the Apostolicals, in distinction from the other orders of monks, do not bind themselves to their mode of life by any outward and formal vows;[3] they are not bound by any outward rule of obedience to a particular class of superiors, but, with them, all the members are held together by the free spirit of love; no other bond exists but the inner one of the Holy Spirit. Thus Dolcino set up against the legal condition, that of gospel liberty. Though the Apostolicals recognized men called of God as the founders and guides of their society, yet they were not subject to them by an outward vow of obedience. The monkish virtue of obedience must wholly cease, according to the principles of the Apostolicals, who admitted no form of obedience whatever, but that of free obedience to God. Dolcino, in his letters to the different communities of the Apostolicals, describes them as brethren mutually subordinate and bound to each other, by ties of affection

[1] Tertius status fuit et est modo dives, avarus, fornicarius, honorabilis et superbus. The word fornicarius may be understood in the proper or the improper apocalyptical sense. Here very probably in the latter, as Dolcino really taught (see Muratori, f. 456): ecclesia Romana est illa meretrix, quae a fide Christi apostavit, and the Apostolical Peter de Lugio styled the corrupt church Babylon, and the great whore of the Apocalypse. In the protocol published by Philip of Limborch, l. c. f. 361.

[2] Nos nec domos habemus nec etiam mendicata portare debemus, says Dolcino. The Apostolical Peter de Lugio, from Spain, Petrus Lucensis, distinguished the perfect and imperfect poverty: the perfecta paupertas, quam tenuerunt Apostoli et omnes illi, qui sequuntur et imitantur eos, videlicet nihil habere, nec in proprio nec in communi. Item est paupertas imperfecta, sicut est religiosorum viventium secundum regulam sancti Augustini et sancti Benedicti, qui habent possessiones et divitias in communi et tales religiosi non sunt perfecti in paupertate, quia habent domos ad manendum et in communi necessaria ad comedendum et bibendum. See the Inquisitional sentence-book of Philip of Limborch, f. 360.

[3] One of the principles of Dolcino in Muratori (t. ix. f. 457): Quod perfectior vita est vivere sine voto, quam cum voto.

without the bond of outward obedience.[1] As Dolcino uniformly opposed the inward power and desecularization of religion, to its externalization and conformity to the world, in the corrupt church, so he undervalued the importance attached to consecrated places of worship. "A church," he is reported to have said, "is no better for prayer to God, than a stable or a sty.[2] Christ may be worshipped as well or even better in groves than in churches." It is clear that the above principle and tendency must have led him to depart in a great many other ways from the church doctrine, than his unsettled life and prevailing practical bent allowed him liberty to express with consciousness; unless it be the fault of the records which we follow, that we have but a very imperfect knowledge of Dolcino's principles in their logical coherence.

Dolcino taught, again, that the church of Rome, by reason of her apostasy and of the prevailing vices among ecclesiastics and monks, had lost all the authority conferred on her in the person of the apostle Peter. This was transferred to the community which restored the Apostolical life, and was to be a refuge for all truly Christian people. The Apostolical Peter, of Lugio, made a distinction betwixt the spiritual and the carnal church (*ecclesia spiritualis et carnalis*). The former consists of those who live in perfect poverty and humility, and in spiritual obedience to God; but the second, of those who live in fleshly lusts, riches, and honor, in the pomp and glory of the world, like the prelates of the church of Rome.

If the representation given by opponents of Dolcino's doctrine is correct, he announced that after the corrupt church had been deprived of her wealth by some king whom God would choose as the instrument of the judgments to be brought upon her, and reduced back to apostolical poverty, the Roman pope and the incorrigible prelates were to be slain, and a new holy pope, the worthy successor of Peter, to be chosen by God himself, and this was to be Dolcino, should he be then living.[3] Unquestionably, it follows from the supposition that the Apostolical brethren represent the restored apostolical church, to which is transferred all the plenitude of the Holy Ghost that distinguished the apostolic age, to which passes over the entire authority bestowed on Peter; from this supposition it unquestionably follows that their divinely commissioned leader must hold the first place; that, namely, which was before occupied by the pope, yet with the modification growing out of the nature of *free* obedience, of the brotherly community, of the universal outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

It is manifest from Dolcino's doctrine as thus set forth, that Joachim's idea of the period of the Holy Ghost harmonizes with it; though

[1] Omnes invicem sine vinculo exterioris obedientiae, sed interioris tantum subjecti et uniti.

[2] Muratori, t. ix, f. 457.

[3] The latter is stated, however, only in the Historia Dolcini in Muratori. According to the Additamentis, which are more accurate in their representation of Dolcino's doctrine, Dolcino distinguishes himself from this pope; and the supposition that he declared himself to be this pope, may have been nothing more than a false conclusion of his enemies.

none of the older contemporary sources ascribe to him this idea.[1] According to Dolcino's doctrine, also, the last period might be called a time of the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as the distinguishing characteristic of this period was to be the free inspiration by the Holy Spirit, in the Apostolical brethren and sisters, of a life no longer depending, as before, on outward means and ordinances, but purely producing itself from within outwards.

We may also mention as a thing deserving notice, that the great poet, Dante, a contemporary, compares Dolcino with Mohammed. He composed his work after Dolcino's death; but he transports himself back to the time when the heresiarch was besieged in those inaccessible mountains covered with snow and ice, where starvation appeared the only method of forcing him to submission. He represents Mohammed therefore as telling Dante, that he might warn brother Dolcino to look out and provide himself well with the means of subsistence; for otherwise he would soon be compelled to yield, and come down to Mohammed in hell.[2] The question is, what led Dante to bring these two personages together? No doubt, because he looked upon him as a false prophet, determined to assert his pretended divine mission with the sword, and had heard of the doctrine of a community of wives, which was imputed to Dolcino by his opponents, and the like. But a certain truth lies at bottom of this comparison, different as these individuals were in other respects. In both, we find a true element of religious enthusiasm, though perverted by the intermingling of natural feelings not controlled, and an imagination not held in curb by the divine life. Both had a partial view of truth in one of its aspects, as opposed to prevailing errors. In the case of Mohammed, enthusiasm for the faith in one Almighty God stood abruptly opposed to polytheism; in the case of Dolcino, enthusiasm for a religious community, estranged from the world, stood abruptly opposed to a worldly church. Both meant, at first, to labor simply as prophets, simply by the word; but afterwards fell into the mistake of appealing to the sword in the defence of truth. In the case of Mohammed, success hurried him on to further steps; in that of Dolcino, it was necessity. Yet in Mohammed, this course of proceeding was certainly grounded in his whole religious mode of thinking, which was an incarnation of Judaism. In Dolcino, it was adopted, in contradiction to the principles originally

[1] Notices of heretics of a later time in the French language, which are to be found in the libraries of Avignon and Marseilles, attribute to Dolcino that whole doctrine about the three ages, or periods. But these surely are no credible sources of information, since we find Dolcino confounded in them with the Fratricelli of the fourteenth century. I am indebted for this account to the kind communications of M. G. Heine of this city, one of my dear young theologians, who has for some years consecrated his means and talents to literary investigations, particularly in the libraries of Spain, from which a rich harvest may be expected in due time. The same friend has also sent me a *historia Dolcini* transcribed by him, which, however, is not different from the one already published by Muratori.

[2] The words in the 28th canto of the Inferno, v. 55.

> Or di a Fra Dolcin dunque, che s' armi,
> Tu che forse vedrai il sole in breve,
> S' egli non vuol qui tosto seguarmi
> Si di vivanda, che stretta di neve
> Non rechi la vittoria al Noarese,
> Ch' altrimenti acquistar non saria lieve

laid down by him. Yet, as he was bent on realizing at once, in the form of an outward community, overlooking, with enthusiastic love, the great gulf betwixt his purpose and its accomplishment, an idea which Christianity would realize by moral spirit and temper in the very process of that historical development which proceeds in conformity with nature, so by this externalization and secularization of a thing that was only to be seized ideally and spiritually, he was hurried along farther and farther in the same course of secular action.

Ideas which have once acquired in a period a certain domination, are wont to lay hold of manifestations proceeding from some entirely different quarter, merely furnishing them a point of attachment; and to stamp their signature upon fanatical tendencies, which happen to meet and mingle with them, assuming in the same some strange, fantastic shape. Thus we may instance, as illustrating the power which the idea of the age of the Holy Ghost exerted on the minds of men in the thirteenth century, a sect otherwise unimportant, which sprung up in the last times of this century in Milan.

In the year 1281, a rich widow of noble rank, died in Milan, Wilhelma, or Wilhelmina, said to have been a Bohemian princess. Having spent in that city the last twenty or thirty years of her life, she secured the love and respect of many by her piety, and especially by her active charities. A circle of men and women, who had placed themselves under her guidance, and were advised and helped by her in their necessities, had become strongly attached to her. She was reverenced as a saint, insomuch that the sick applied to her for healing. Already in her lifetime she began to be made an object of extravagant, fanatical veneration; though such demonstrations were never sanctioned by herself, but repelled with abhorrence: but this veneration was not to be suppressed in that way; on the contrary, it increased so much the more after her death.

A citizen of Milan, Andrew Saramita, who seems to have united in himself the characters of impostor and fanatic, undertook to work upon this feeling. The body of Wilhelmina, which had been already buried, was disinterred. Having first been bathed in water and wine, it was enwrapped in costly purple robes, fringed with silver and gold. To the water in which the body had been washed, the bewildered enthusiasts ascribed a miraculous virtue; over the recent grave of Wilhelmina they erected a magnificent altar, and pilgrims flocked in great numbers to the spot. It was not enough to honor Wilhelmina as a saint. The veneration exceeded all bounds; the spirit of dissatisfaction and opposition with the dominant church was doubtless connected with it. In Wilhelmina, it was pretended, the Holy Spirit had become incarnate. After the worship of the incarnation of the Divine Word in Christ, was to follow the worship of the Holy Spirit incarnate in Wilhelmina. A new age of the Holy Ghost was to begin. The ancient hierarchy, at whose head stood the vicar of Christ, was to cease; a new female hierarchy, corresponding to the incarnation of the Holy Spirit in a woman, at whose head stood a vicar of Wilhelmina, as the incarnate Holy Spirit, was to take its place. For the

present, this place was filled by the nun Mayfreda of Tirovano. In the year 1300 this sect was put down by force, and those who stood at the head of it perished at the stake.[1]

Since then, as appears evident from the facts above presented, the church had now to engage in a violent contest with tendencies of spirit, struggling in opposition to her, continually multiplying and continually spreading,— a contest such as had never occurred before,— she must be driven (in case she would concede nothing to religious needs manifesting themselves with such power, but was determined to maintain her position against all opposition) to employ every means at her command for the purpose of suppressing an insurrection which could not be put down by spiritual might alone. Those principles of ecclesiastical law, on the ground of which all violent measures against heresies could be justified, had, indeed, long since been shaped out on the foundation laid by Augustin; and the systematic theologians of the thirteenth century needed, in the present case, only to build further on the same foundation. But the bishops were too busily occupied with other concerns to ferret out, in all quarters, the sects which, with so much zeal and so much prudence, sought to spread themselves in the communities; and in many districts, where the anti-churchly spirit had already become too powerful, they were no longer regarded in the communities with the requisite respect. This was especially the case in South France, in Languedoc, in the territory of the counts of Toulouse; districts where also at a later period Protestantism gained a wide spread, and sought to maintain itself in a sanguinary struggle,— where the opponents of the dominant church found protection from mighty lords, and the localities of a mountainous region afforded them safe retreats. The clergy, and the church service had here, ever since the last times of the twelfth century, been treated with contempt and ridicule. A characteristic proof of this was the colloquial phrase used in these districts to express a supreme feeling of disgust: "I would rather be a chaplain than that." By mere chance, the sects scattered in South France[2] received the common name of Albigenses from one of the districts, where the agents of the church who came to combat them, found them mostly to abound,[3]— the district around the

[1] See the extracts from the trial preserved in the Ambrosian library in the literary tour to Italy, of the Bohemian historiographer, Franz Palacky. Prague, 1838, p. 72, and on.

[2] The man who during the crusades against the Albigenses wrote in verse in the Provençal language the history of this war, published by Fauriel, in the Collection des documens inédits sur l'histoire de France, Paris, 1837, says, that the sects were thickly spread throughout the whole province of Alby, Carcassone, Laurac, in a great part of the province of Beziers as far as Bourdeaux: — — — la eretgia | Era tant fort monteia cui domni Dieus maldia | Que trastotz Albeges (absolutely all, — the appended adverb *tras* gives a superlative signification to the adjective *tous*), avia en sa bailia | Carcasses, Lauragues, tot la major partia | De Bezers tro a Bordel si col cami tenia (as far as the way goes), A motz de lor crezens e de lor companhia (many of their faith and of their party). In the above-mentioned poem, v. 30, et seq.

[3] In the Histoire générale de Languedoc, published by the Maurins, an important work in reference to the history of these struggles (t. iii, A. D. 1737), it is asserted, in connection with that inquiry concerning the origin of the name Albigeois, which first threw more light on this subject (note xiii, f. 553), that the heretics were by no means particularly spread over this district, and

town of Alba, or Alby; and by this common name they were known from the commencement of the thirteenth century.[1] Under this general denomination parties of different tenets were comprehended together, but the Catharists seem to have constituted a predominant element among the people thus designated. Innocent the Third, a pope accustomed to act in all cases with vigor, well understood that extraordinary measures were needed to suppress the heretical tendencies so rapidly advancing, which threatened wholly to sever the connection betwixt these districts and the church of Rome. As the bishops, who were here even looked upon with contempt, had shown themselves too weak or too inactive, he chose for his instruments the monks,—an order in which the most faithful, zealous, and active organs of the hierarchy were ever to be found, and in whose hands was already placed an exorbitant power independent of the bishops,—the germ of the future inquisitions. At the very commencement of his papal reign, in 1198, he sent to South France two Cistercians, Rainer and Guido, whom he recommended to the bishops and magistrates of those districts, calling upon them to sustain them in their labors in all possible ways. These monks, on whom the pope conferred unlimited powers to proceed against the heretics, were to endeavor to convince them, by argument, of their errors, and if they did not succeed in this way, to pronounce the ban upon them. The nobles and magistrates should then expel the obstinate from the country, having first confiscated their goods; and if they ventured to come back again, they were to be visited with still severer punishments. The same punishments were suspended over all who dared to harbor the heretics as over the heretics themselves. These papal delegates were authorized to employ ban and interdict for the purpose of enforcing obedience to the appointed measures. But to those who, in the case of so great a danger threatening the church, contended against the heretics with fidelity and devotion, employing the power of the sword bestowed on them by God for the preservation of the faith, the pope promised the same indulgence which was granted to pilgrims to the tomb of St. Peter, or to St. Jago di Compostella. It is curious to observe the strange medley, not uncommon, indeed, nor new to this age, of juridical, ethical, and religious ideas in the way in which the pope proceeds to justify the severity of these measures for suppressing the heretics, when he says that these sects sought to rob men, not of their earthly goods, but of the spiritual life; for he who deprives a man of faith, robs him of his life, since the just man lives by his faith.[2]

that it was not this which had occasioned the more general use of that name; but the above-cited words of the Provençal poet prove the contrary.

[1] The words in the dedication, addressed to the pope, in the so-often cited Chronicle of the monk Peter of Vaux-Sernai: Unde sciant, qui lecturi sunt, quia in pluribus hujus operis locis Tolosani et aliarum civitatum et castrorum haeretici et defensores eorum generaliter Albigenses vocantur, eo quod aliae nationes haereticos Provinciales Albigenses consueverint appellare.

[2] Nec volumus ipsos aegre ferre aliquatenus, si eos ad id exequendum tam districte compelli praecipimus, cum ad nil amplius intendamus, uti severitatis judicio, quam ad exstirpandos haereticos, qui non nobis substantiam temporalem, sed spiritualem vitam surripere moliuntur; nam qui

But we have seen on a former page[1] how bishop Diego of Osma, in Spain, and Dominick, joined themselves to these men, and endeavored to introduce a more spiritual mode of dealing with the heretics. Several colloquies were held on the disputed points with the leading men of the heretical communities. But it was impossible that these transactions, where the two parties proceeded on such opposite principles, should lead to any favorable result; and then, the heretics were found fault with because they would not so easily allow themselves to be converted. In a religious conference of this sort, which was held in 1207, at Montreal, near Carcassone, betwixt the above mentioned Spanish bishop, Dominick, and a pastor of the so-called Albigenses, Arnold Hot,[2] the latter defended the three following theses: That the church of Rome is not the bride of Christ, not the holy church, but the Babylon of the Apocalypse, drunk with the blood of saints and martyrs; that her doctrine is a doctrine of Satan, her constitution not a holy one, founded by Christ; that the mass, in the way in which it was at present celebrated, did not originate from Christ and the apostles. But as nothing could be effected by sermons[3] and disputation, and it was believed that nothing could be found in the heretics but incorrigible obstinacy in their rebellion against the church, it was deemed necessary to resort to more compulsory measures. The assassination of one of the papal delegates, added afterwards to the first, the monk Peter of Castelnau (*Pierre de Château neuf*, *Petrus a Castro novo*), in 1208,[4] — which the pope attributed to count Raimund of Toulouse, whom he had excommunicated, though he was afterwards compelled to acknowledge the groundlessness of this accusation; — this melancholy event furnished the signal for a thirty years' bloody war, in which the worst outrages of fanaticism and cupidity were practised against the inhabitants of these districts,[5] — the famous crusade against the Albigenses. The principle that every heretic, or protector of heretics, should lose his land, and that this should fall into the hands of others,

fidem adimit, vitam furatur, justus enim ex fide vivit. See the letter of Innocent to the archbishop of Aix (Aquae), and the bishops of his diocese, lib. i, ep. 93.

[1] See above, p. 269.

[2] The protocol of this religious conference was composed in the Catalonian tongue. An extract from it was first published by Nicole Vignier in his Histoire de l'Eglise, and from this book, which has not fallen under my eye, archbishop Usher has transcribed it in his work: De christianarum ecclesiarum in occidentis praesertim partibus ab apostolicis temporibus ad nostram usque aetatem continua successione et statu, f. 157, Londini, 1687.

[3] The above-mentioned Provençal poet, who has given the history of the war with the Albigenses, says, sermons were, to the heretics, not worth a rotten apple. No prezan lo prezio (the preaching) una poma porria. See l. c. v. 52.

[4] Pope Innocent the Third says (lib. xi, ep. 26) that, when dying, he prayed God to forgive his murderers. Also the abovementioned Provençal poet, stating that one of the equerries of the Count of Toulouse had murdered Peter of Castelnau, says that the latter, in the presence of all, prayed God to forgive that person his sin.

El preguet domni deu vezent tota la jant,
Quels perdo sos pecatz a cel felo sarjant.

See v. 90.

[5] The above Provençal poet reports that the besiegers of the town of Chasseneuil, when they saw themselves compelled to raise the siege, first condemned many heretics to the stake, and cast many beautiful heretic females into the flames, who, though urgently importuned, would not consent to be converted.

E cela ost jutgero mot eretge arder
E mota bela eretga ins en lo foc giter,
Car convertir non volon tan nols podon prier.

See v. 322.

furnished an encouragement and pretext for every species of cupidity. The pope himself was compelled to see worldly interests and motives giving direction to the movement he had excited, and could no longer control.[1] A remark worthy of notice was uttered by a certain count Roger de Foix. During the negotiations for peace, in the year 1228, he declared the pope had no business to meddle in the concerns of his religion; for that was a matter in which each man must enjoy his liberty: "This liberty," he said, "his father had always recommended to him; assuring him that, with it, and a mind resolved to maintain it, he might look on calmly though the very vault of heaven gave way and broke over his head; for he had nothing to fear."[2] After the land had been laid waste for thirty years, the blood of thousands had been spilt, and a general submission had thus, in the year 1229, been finally brought about by force, the maintenance of the faith was still by no means secured for the future. The sects destroyed by fire and sword sprung up afresh out of the same needs of the spirit from which they had sprung up at the beginning. It required the unceasing vigilance of spiritual despotism to prevent the renewal of those anti-churchly tendencies.

At a council of Toulouse, held in 1229, it was ordered, after the precedent of measures appointed already at the Lateran council, c. iii, in 1215, that a permanent Inquisition should be established against the heretics. 1. The bishops were to appoint in all the communities, in city and country, a priest, and with him two or three, or if necessary several laymen, of good standing and character, and bind them by oath, carefully and faithfully to ferret out the heretics, to search suspected houses, subterranean chambers, and other hiding-places, all which should be destroyed; to lodge as speedily as possible with the archbishop, bishop, or the lord or magistrate of the province, an information against detected heretics, their patrons and concealers, after first taking every precautionary measure to prevent their escape, in order that they might be brought to condign punishment, c. xii. In every commune all males, from the age of fourteen and upward, and females from the age of twelve, should abjure all doctrines in hostility to the church of Rome, also swear that they would preserve the Catholic faith which the church of Rome holds and preaches, and persecute and conscientiously make known all heretics, according to their ability. That this oath might be taken by every individual, the names of all the men and women in each parish should be recorded. And if any person should be absent at the time of the taking of this oath, and did not take it within fourteen days after his return, he should be put down as suspected of heresy. This oath should be renewed once in every two years. Manifold disadvantages should, in civil life, be connected with the fact that a man was even suspected of heresy. But every man was so suspected, whom public rumor accused of that crime.

[1] See a letter of Innocent the Third to his legates, in which he declares against the unjust proceedings of the count of Toulouse. Lib. xv, ep. 102.

[2] See Paul Perrin, Histoire des Albigeois, Genève, 1568, p. 141, from a manuscript account of the life of this count.

Though, according to the church constitution up to this time, it belonged to the bishops to administer and direct all such measures, yet, for the reasons already mentioned, the practice was adopted, by pope Gregory the Ninth, in 1232–33, after the example set by Innocent the Third, of selecting for this purpose monks, who might proceed independently of the bishops, and particularly from that order which had derived its origin from the contests with the heretics, the order of the Dominicans. Thus were formed those tribunals which obtained special jurisdiction over cases of transgression coming within the spiritual province, the *inquisitores haereticae pravitatis*. The church hypocritically deprecated the appearance of having anything to do with the shedding of blood, but used the secular power as its executioner, the blind tool of its cruel fanaticism. The convicts, excommunicated by the spiritual tribunal, were handed over to the secular power, which put them to the stake. The arbitrary violence of these tribunals, instituted first in Toulouse and Carcassone, and in Spain, might light also upon such as in any way fell under the suspicion of the zealots for orthodoxy, or of the hierarchy, or against whom their enemies might seek, in the charge of heresy, a means of revenge.

When such a power against heresy first began to be formed, it was the priest Conrad of Marburg who was charged with the execution of it in Germany; a man in whose hands such power must have been especially dangerous, on account of his inexorable severity and his credulity, at a time when, after the year 1230, the sects were uninterruptedly spreading in the countries about the Rhine.[1] Conrad's example showed how ruinous those measures appointed by Innocent the Third and Gregory the Ninth against the heretics and those suspected of heresy might prove, not to the heretics alone, but to persons who in this respect were altogether innocent. No man was safe before the terrific power of Conrad; he exercised it, unscrupulously, against the highest as well as the humblest individuals. A man once accused of heresy, could save his life only by declaring himself guilty, and confirming all that had ever been said by the most extravagant rumors concerning the assemblies of the heretics, and subjecting himself to penance. But he who would not confess, was held to be guilty, and burnt. These accusations were employed as means of revenge.[2] The archbishop of Mentz and the Dominican Bernhard held it necessary, afterwards, to draw up a report to the old credulous pope, Gregory the Ninth, concerning the arbitrary use which Conrad the priest made of the power entrusted to him, and the disorders thus created in Germany.[3] His credulous fanaticism also brought war and devastation over another district of Germany. That branch of Frieslanders which dwelt in the territory of Oldenburg, the Stedingers, had been involved, by their inflexible love of liberty, in violent contests with the nobles and with the clergy, the archbishop of Bremen in particular. The rebellion

[1] See above, p. 609.

[2] See the description in the Gestis Trevirorun i, c. civ, and c. cv, f. 317.

[3] See Extracts therefrom in the Chronicon of Alberic, A. D. 1233, in the Accessiones historicae of Leibnitz, t. ii, p. 543.

against the hierarchy arose here, not from a religious but from a political element. But this furnished occasion for drawing the matter within the religious province. Conrad of Marburg could believe the most extravagant things of the Stedingers, and make them believed by the pope. After the crusade against the Albigenses followed that against the Stedingers: the pope surrendered the poor people victims to their enemies; but when, after their subjection, the church became reconciled with them, the accusation of heresy which had been brought against them — the groundlessness of which must probably have been well known — was no longer mentioned. Conrad of Marburg at length fell himself a victim to his own ferocity; the vengeance of a mighty lord, whom he had without cause stigmatized as an heretic, overtook him, and he was murdered in 1233. These unfortunate events had however a beneficial effect, in that they operated as a warning and terrifying example for Germany, which kept the tribunal of the Inquisition at a distance from that country.

GENERAL INDEX.

A.

Abbots, obtain the insignia of the Episcopal office, 201, 202. Pomp of, 264. Absorbed in secular business, 364. Abelard on the, 384.
Abel, 573.
Abel-Rémusat, 51, n. 2.
Abelard, 64. Wretched situation of the Jews, 72, n. 1. Arnold of Brescia, 147, 148, 150. Hypocritical monks, 243. Norbert, 246 and n. 1. Roscelin, 247, n. 4. The miracles of his time, 256, n. 3, 257. Doctrine of Transubstantiation, 337. Against the abuse of the mass, 346. Indulgences, 350, 351. Roscelin, 356, n. 2. Moral standing of the ancient philosophers, 359, n. 1, 383, 384. Representative of the dialectic tendency, 371. Life and doctrine, 373–401. Scito te ipsum; Sic et non, 386, 390, 394. "On the Supreme good," 399. Hugo, 407. Bernard (see Life) 408, 409. Walter of St. Victor, 410. Richard of St. Victor, 413. Omnipresence of God, 450–452. Omnipotence of God, 453–457. Doctrine of the Trinity, 458–460, 462, 465. Conception of miracles, 467, 469. Anthropology, 493–495. Original sin, 494. Sinlessness of Jesus, 495, 496. Doctrine of Atonement, 501–505. Intention in actions, 528. Usefulness of doubt, 538, n. 1, (392). Peter of Bruis, 595, n. 1.
Abraham, 396, 544.
Absalom, bishop of Roeskilde, 31, 32.
Absentees, 201, 207.
Absolute, idea of the, 441, 445.
Absolution, 347–349. Papal, 103. General, 348, 349.
Abulfeda, 181, n. 3.
Acco, (St. Jean d'Acre,) 60.
Accusations against Jews and heretics, 72, 73, 586.
Adalbero, bishop of Würzburg, 107.
Adalbert, archbishop of Bremen, 33.
Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, 41, 42.
Adalbert, companion of Otto of Bamberg, 17, 25.
Adam, with Abelard, 494, 495. With the Bogomiles, 554. The Catharists, 572, 573, 579.
Ademar, bishop of Puy, 125.
Adiaphora, 387, 524, 525. Adiaphorism, 448.
Adolph, duke of Holstein, 35.
Adrian IV., pope, 161–167, 195, n. 2.
Advent of Christ, 622.
Aegidius of Assisi, 311.
Aeons, 553.
Ages of the church, 227–232, 621–626, 634, 637, n. 1. Of the world, 622.
Agnes, empress, mother of Henry IV., 103.
Aix la Chapelle, rule drawn up at, 208.
Alanus Magnus, 417, 461.
Alberic, 181, n. 2. Chronicon, 604, n. 2, 643, n. 3.
Alberic of Citeaux, 252.
Alberic of Ostia, 603.
Albert, abbot of Stade, 610, n. 2.
Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, 266.
Albertus Magnus, defends the monastic orders, 286. Withdrawal of the cup, 345. His life, 421. Aquinas, 422. Faith and knowledge, 429. The book de Causis, 445, n. 1. Scotus, 445, n. 4. David of Dinanto, 446, n. 1, 447, n. 1. Doctrine of God, 449. Trinity, 463. Miracles, 470, 471. Foreknowledge and predestination, 477. Doctrine of grace, 518.
Albigenses (Albigeois), 270, 570, 616, n. 7, 639–642, 644.
Albin, companion of Otto of Bamberg, 20.
Alboin, priest, 100, n. 2.
Albrecht (Albert) of Apeldern, 38.
Albrecht (Albert) the Bear, 21, 32.
Alby, 603, 640.
Aleth, Bernard's mother, 252.
Alexander of Hales, representative of the scholastic theology, 420. Faith and knowledge, 427, 428. Knowledge of God, 443. Trinity, 462. Miracles, 469. Prescience and predestination, 476. Original Condition, 488–490, 491. Uncertainty with regard to the state of grace, 513. Freewill, 518, 519.
Alexander, theologian, 174.
Alexander II., pope, 85, and n. 1, 106.
Alexander III., pope, 167, 168, 173, 194, 201, 207, 214, 218, 416, 582, n. 4, 608.
Alexander IV., pope, 188, 283, 289, 421, 620.
Alexandrian church teachers, 378.
Alexandrian Gnosis, 568. Judaism, 571.
Alexiopolis, 564.
Alexius Comnenus, 559, 560, 564.
Alexius II., Greek emperor, 530.
Alger, scholastic, 338, n. 3.
All Saints, church of, 550.

Almaric of Bena, 221, n. 417, n., 5, 445–447, 449, 618, 619, n. 3.
Almsgiving, Innocent III. on, 306. For the dead 597. Waldenses, 616.
Alphanus, poem by, 83, n. 1.
Altmann, bishop of Passau, 111, 112.
Alvarus Pelagius, Spanish writer, 633, n. 2.
Ambrose of Milan, 578, n. 5. His example made use of in the controversy between Gregory VII. and Henry IV., 110.
Ambrose of Siena, 295, 296.
Anabaptists, 595.
Anabasis of Isaiah, 572, and n. 1.
Anaclete II., pope, 144–146.
Ἀναστοικείωσις, 562.
Anathema, 103.
Anchorets, 239, 241–243, 243, n. 1. 264–266.
Andreas, Bambergian abbot, 2, n. 1, 4, n. 1, 7, n. 1, 26, n. 2.
Andrew, archbishop of Lund, 39.
Andrew Saramita, 638.
Andronicus, Greek emperor, 548.
Angels, with Robert Pullein, 486. The Bogomiles, 553, 554. The Catharists, 567, 568, 570, 572, 573.
Angers, count of, 90.
Anna Comnena, 108, n.
Anselm, bishop of Lucca, 101, n. 2.
Anselm of Canterbury. Ordinances of Gregory VII., 100, n. 3. Concerning monasticism, 237, 238. Directory to the spiritual life, 240. Superstitious veneration of Saints, 329. Concomitance, 344, n. 5. Roscelin, 360, notes 2, 3. Life and doctrine, 361–371, 373, 379, 401, 427. Becomes archbishop of Canterbury, 364. The ontological proof, 440–443, 444, (368, n. 2.) Omnipotence of God, 453, 455. Doctrine of the Trinity, 457, 458. Prescience and predestination, 474, 475. Doctrine of the original condition, 485, 486, 492, 493. Doctrine of Atonement, 498–501, 503, 505. Justifying faith, 511. Freewill, 515, 585. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 536.
Anselm of Havelburg, 530, n. 3, 536, 537.
Anselm of Laon, 373.
Antagonisms in thought, 355, 356, n. 1.
Anthelm, bishop, 168, n. 3.
Anthony, fire of St., 266. Society of St., 266.
Anthony of Padua, 291.
Anthropology in the scholastic period, 485–495. In the sects, — see the particular sects.
Anthropomorphism, 225.
Antichrist, 186, 226, 284, 605, 606, 615, 616, n. 7, 619, 622.
Anti-Hildebrandian party, 94, n. 4, 98 and n. 2.
Antiochian school, 507.
Antwerp, church at, 592, n. 2.
Apocalypse, 221, n., 228, 616, 617, 618, 620, n. 3, 635, n. 1, 641.
Apocryphal writings, 558. See Gospel.
Apologists, against Islam, Raymund Lull, 61–71, 426, 427. Against the Jews, 77–81. Guibert of Nogent, 325. Peter of Cluny, 328. Thomas Aquinas, 422. William of Auvergne, 423, n. 4.
Apostles' creed, 627.
Apostolical church, 623.
Apostolicals, 34, 219, 303, 593, 604, 607, 610, 626–638.
Appeals to the pope, 166, 199, 395, 396, 544.
Arabian philosophy, 325, 444, 445, n. 1. Plato, 420.
Arabians, influence on culture, 420.
Arabic language, 62, 65, 436. Translations from the, 417, 444, 445. Platonists, 420.
Archdeacons, 211–213.
Archivarius, 545, 546.
Arcona, 31.
Aristotle, influence of, 356, 417–420, 429, 434, n. 2, 449, 450. Abelard, 392. Richard de St. Victor, 413. The book, "de causis," 445 and n. 1. Anthropology, 488. In the scholastic doctrine of morals, 518–520, 523, 526, 527. Nicetas, 537. Catharists, 567.
Armanno Punzilovo, Catharist, 584, n. 1. 585.
Armenia, Raymund Lull in, 68.
Arnold, Catharist bishop, 589.
Arnold, Franciscan companion of John of Monte Corvino, 57.
Arnold Hot, Waldensian, 641.
Arnold of Brescia, 147–152, 157, 160–162, 172, 180, 208, 268, 398, 626, 630.
Ars generalis, Raymund Lull, 63, 65.
Arsenians, 544, 550, 551.
Arsenius, patriarch of Constantinople, 543, 544, 551.
Art, pagan, 14, 15. Arts, 37. In monasteries, 252, 264. See Pictures, Churches.
Ascelin, monk, 49, 50.
Asceticism, Bernard, 2, Otto, 5. Bernard of Clairvaux, 144, 253. Hildegard on, 217. Monastic, 238, 241, 263. Robert of Arbrissel, 246. Peter of Cluny, 249, 250. Francis of Assisi, 273–275. Raymund Lull on, 310. Anselm, 365, 366. Among the Catharists, 579–582. Other sects, 593, 594. Dolcino, 633. Compare Monasticism, Evangelical poverty.
Asia, spread and limitation of Christianity in, 45–59.
Assassination of excommunicated persons, 129 and n. 4.
Assemani, 46, notes 1, 2.
Assurance, 513, 514. See State of Grace.
Atheists, 531 and n. 5.
Atonement, doctrine of, 497–508.
Auditores, 580.
Augsburg, School at, 143, n. 5.
Augustin, 359, 360, 368, 376, 387, 389, 392, 409, 424, 427, 434, 441, 448, 457,

474, 479, 485, 492–497, 505, 510, 515–518, 566, n. 2, 639. Rule of, 208, 245, 270. Peter of Cluny, 251, n. 1. The Lord's Supper, 337. Anselm compared with, 369. Doctrine of reconciliation, 497.
Auricular confession, 353.
Ave Maria, 627.
Averrhoes, 70, 426, 431, 449.
Aybert, 238.

B.

Babylon in the Apocalypse. Joachim, 222. Oliva, 624, 625. The apostolicals, 628, 635, n. 1, 641.
Bal Cernay, Chronicle of, 570, n. 4.
Baldrich, bishop of Dôle, 126, n. 2, 127, notes, 247, n. 2.
Bamberg, 3, 4.
Ban, 105, n. 4, 108, 109, 111, 113, 131 and n. 2, 132, 176, 178, 179, 183, n. 3, 200, 548, 590, 640.
Bandinus, magister, 410, n. 1.
Baptism, compare Sacraments among the Sects. Of heathen converts, — see Spread of Christianity. Immersion, 8. Preparation for, 8. By laymen, 99. With the Bogomiles, 556, 563. Chrysomalos, 561. Niphon, 563. Catharists, 577. Of the Spirit, 571, 575, 576, 577. Infant baptism, 593, 595, 601, 615.
Bartholomew, Catharist pope, 590.
Baruch, Jew, 79.
Basilius, Bogomile, 559.
Batu, Mongolian prince, 51.
Beatrice, Margravine, 91.
Bec, monastery of, 361, 362.
Beccus, Johannes, 545.
Becket, Thomas à, 169–172.
Bede, 382, n. 3.
Begging monks, 269–292.
Beghardi, 286, 292, 303, 626, 628, n. 1, 633, n. 2.
Beguinae, Beguttae, 286. Compare Beghardi.
Belgard, city in Pommerania, 16.
Believers, among the Catharists, 576, 579, 580.
Bema, Manichean festival, 566, n. 3.
Benedict, priest, companion of Adalbert of Prague, 41.
Benedict, rule of 264, 634.
Benedict Cajetan, 193 and n. 3.
Benedictine monasticism, 251, 252.
Benedictio, 196.
Benefices, plurality of, 207.
Beneficium, 164–166.
Benevolence, works of, 12, 18, 23, 30, 73, 213, 214, 239, n. 1, 254, 294–299.
Benevolent institutions, 214, 266–268, 294–296, 299.
Benno, cardinal, 85, n. 1.
Benvenuto of Imola, 629, n. 4, 630, n. 2.
Berengar, disciple of Abelard, 257, 262, n. 2, 395 and n. 1, 399, n. 3.
Berengarius of Tours, 84, 86, n. 4, 92, n. 1, 335, 337, 355.
Bernald, abbot, 145, n., 254, n. 3, 255, n 2.
Bernard, bishop, missionary in Pommerania, 2, 3, 5, 6.
Bernard, Dominican, 643.
Bernard, priest, sectarian, 448.
Bernard of Clairvaux, 83, n. 2, 206, n. 4, 207, n. 1. Protects the Jews, 73–75. Innocent II., 144–146. Arnold of Brescia, 148, n. 2, 149, n. 1, 150 and n. Eugene, III. 152. Admonitions to Eugene III., 152, 157–160, 194, 195, 197, 199, 201, 202. The Crusades, 153–157. Legates, 198. Appeals to Rome, 199. Corrupt clergy, 206, n. 1. Boys in ecclesiastical offices, 207, n. 1. Abbess Hildegard, 217. His mother, 234, 252. Conversion of the condemned robber, 236. Monasticism, 238. Counsels to monks, 240. History and character, 252–264. On love, 259–262, 386. Calumny, 262. Self knowledge, 263. Doctrine of the immaculate conception, 331, 332. The denier of Transubstantiation, 337. Stages of the religious life, 371, 372. His theory of knowledge, 371–373. Abelard, 393–400, 495. Knowledge of the prophets, 405, n. 1. Gerhoh, 408, n. 1. Robert Pullein, 408. Gilbert de la Poree, 408, 409. Peter Lombard, 409. Richard de St. Victor, 411. Guigo, 413. The Trinity, 460, 462. Confession of faith, 462, 516. Doctrine of atonement, 503, 504. Doctrine of justification, 509. Freewill, 516, 517. The Catharists, 568, n. 2, 578, n, 5, 580, n. 1, 586, 593. Henry the Cluniacensian, 598, notes, 601, n. 2, 603, 604.
Bernard of Pisa, 152. See Eugene III.
Bernard of Tiron, 97, n. 8, 236, 237, n. 1, 294, 308, 312.
Bernard Ydros, 606 and n. 4.
Bernard's mother, 234, 252.
Bernold of Constance, 100, n. 2, 108, n., 110, n. 3, 125, n. 1, 127, notes 1, 7, 128, n. 3.
Bertha, 121.
Berthold, abbot, 217, n. 2.
Berthold, bishop of Liefland, 37.
Berthold, Franciscan, preacher of repentance, 279, 318–320, 351, 352, 600.
Berthold of Calabria, founder of the order of Carmelites, 266.
Berthold of Constance, 233, n., 303, n. 2.
Berthrade, 121, 122.
Bertulph of Carinthia, 96, n. 6.
Besançon, diet at, 164.
Bible, study of the, 98, n. 2, 204, 314, 422, 561, 563. Reading of the, among the laity, 320–324, 425. Forbidden, 320–324. In the sects, 558, 559, 594, 595, 597, 601 and n. 4, 602, 609, 632. Knowledge of, 611. Commentaries on, 426. See Commentaries Concord-

ance, 426. Division into chapters, 616, n. 7. Joachim, 220. Anselm, 368, 370. Hugo of St. Victor on, 401, 402, 405, 406. Roger Bacon, 425. Waldenses, 606–614, (321.) See Scriptures.
Bible meetings, 321.
Bible translation, Tartar, 58. In the sects, 320, 321, 324. Waldenses, 606, 611. German, 609.
Biblical criticism, the Jews, 77, 78, sects, 558, 559, 571 and n. 5.
Biblical interpretation, 98, n. 2, 377, 404, 405, 571, 601.
Biblical tendency, 593.
Bishops, deposition of, 107. Relations to the pope, 107, 200–202. In the contest between the popes and the empire, 165. Archdeacons, 211, 212. Administration of the office of; activity; the German Bishops; secular avocations of; episcopi in partes infidelium, suffraganei, 213–215. Abelard on the bishops of his time, 384.
Blanche, mother of Louis IX., 300.
Boethius, 355, 359.
Bogomiles, doctrine and history, 552–564, 566, 572, n. 1, 574.
Bolak, city of the Mongols, 55.
Boleslav I., duke of Poland, 41.
Boleslav III., 1–24.
Bologna, university at, 172, 203, 204, 421.
Bona, 343, n. 4.
Bona naturalia et gratuita, 495.
Bonacursus, 590, n. 7.
Bonaventura, Francis of Assisi, 60, n. 2, 271, n., 273 and notes, 274 and notes. Defense of the monastic orders, 286–289. As censor of the same, 289–291. Property of the Franciscans, 291, n. Doctrine of transubstantiation, 339, 340. Life and character, 420, 421. Faith and knowledge, 428, 429. End of creation, 466. Original condition, 490, 491. The incarnation and the original plan of God, 507, 508. Successor of John of Parma, 618, n. 1.
Boni homines, 303, 579.
Boni valeti, 303.
Boniface, 43, 200.
Boniface, fictitious personage, 42, n. 2.
Boniface. See Bruno.
Boniface VIII., 67, 632.
Books, 529. Transcription of, 265, 301. Burned, 448.
Boys in clerical offices, 186, 200, 207.
Bremen, 35. Liefland, 36–38. School in, 33. Archbishop of, 643.
Bribery, at Rome, 103.
Brindisi, crusaders at, 178.
Bruno, (Boniface,) 42, 43.
Bruno, founder of the Carthusian order, 265.
Brussa, 550.
Buddhism, among the Mongols, 52. In China, 56.
Bugia, Raymund Lull there, 68, 69 and n 2, 71 and n. 2.
Bugri, 565.
Bulgari, 565.
Bulls, forged, 204, 205.
Burdinus, archbishop of Braga, 141.
Burkhard of Worms, 203.

C.

Caesarius of Heisterbach, 155, n. 5, 156 and n. 3, 214, n. 2, 234, n. 4, 235, 239, n. 2, 305, n. 2, 321, n. 1, 414, n. 2, 448, notes, 582, n. 4, 585, n, 3, 589, n. 5.
Cain, 573 and n. 1.
Calixtus II., pope, 142, n. 3, 143, 245.
Cambalu, (Pekin,) 57–59.
Cammin, city in Pommerania, 9.
Canisius, 2, n. 1.
Canonical law, 204, 425.
Canonical life, 205–207, 208.
Canonici, 208.
Canossa, castle of, 114.
Canute, son of Henry the converter of the Wends, 32.
Cappadocia, bishops of, 563.
Captives, redemption of, 12, 18, 30, 268.
Caracorum, chief city of Kerait, 46, 51, 53.
Carcasonne, 590, 639, n. 2. Religious conference at, 641. Inquisition in, 643.
Cardinal virtues, 520–522.
Cardinals, 197. Determination of the choice of popes, 167, 192, 193.
Carmel, 266.
Carmelites, 266.
Carthusians, 262, n. 2, 264, 265.
Cassino, Monte, monastery, 421.
Catechumens, Catharist, 580.
Catharists, 219, 304, 556, n. 2. History and doctrine, 565–592, 593, 594, 603, n. 4, 610, 611, notes 6, 7, 612 and n. 3, 640.
Catholic church, 552, n. 3, 553.
Causes, contingent and necessary, 477, 478.
Causeum (Chaussey), island, 236.
Celestin II., pope, 151.
Celestin III., pope, 173, 221, n.
Celestin IV., pope, 183.
Celestin V., pope, 67, 193, 632.
Celibacy, 146 and n. 2. Ordinances of Gregory VII., 93–100. Results, 206. Relaxation of laws concerning, 119. Robert of Arbrissel, 246. Henry the Cluniacensian, 598, 600, 601, n. 4.
Certroy, 267.
Chaldee, 426.
Chaos, 572, 575.
Charlemagne, 133.
Charles II., king of Naples, 193.
Chartres, assembly at, 154.
Chartreux (Cartusium), 265.
Chasseneuil, siege of, 641, n. 5.
Children, Christian education of, 294. Crusade of, 342, n. 5. Piety in, 342, 343.

Chiliasm, of the abbot Joachim, 227–229.
China, Christianity in 47, 56–59. See Mongols.
Christ, person of; Divinity of Christ defended against Jews, 325. Against doubts derived from the Gospels, 328. Sinlessness of Jesus, 495–497. The incarnation, and the original plan of the world, 507, 508. Christ as the centre of religious knowledge and life, Bernard, 258, 261, 262. Spiritual poverty, 283. Divinity, 328. With the sects, 554, 555 and notes, 558, 559, 567, 569–575, 590, 591. Death of, Oliva, 620.
Christian life, 293–313.
Christian of Oliva, missionary in Prussia, 43–45.
Christianity, extension and limitation in Europe, 1–45. In Asia, 45–59. Among Mohammedans and Jews, 59–81. Joachim, 230, 231.
Christology. See person of Christ, Redemption, Trinity.
Chrysostom, 559.
Church, Christian, Corruption of the, 93, 187, n. 2, 211, 215, 216, 220, 628, 631. See Church Property. Mediation of the, 320, 354, 509, 514. Periods of development, see Joachim. John Peter de Oliva. Dolcino, 635. The Bogomiles, 559.
Church and State. Compare Papacy.
Church attendance, 317.
Church buildings, 557, 597, 636.
Church discipline, 347–354.
Church fathers, 392, 401, 416, 424.
Church in its internal organization, 192–215. Compare Papacy.
Church jurisdiction, Benevolent institutions. See those articles.
Church property, 138, 139, 142. Source of corruption, 215, 216, 224, 284.
Church psalmody, 58, 597. German, 155.
Churches, building of, 5, 16, 17, 22, 32, 34, 58, 293 and n 1. Indulgences for, 351. Repairing of, 272.
Cintius, Roman, 108.
Circumcision, 591.
Cistercian abbots, and the mission in Prussia, 44. Innocent III., 173, n. 4. Order, 251–254, 263, 314. Cistercians sent to put down the sects, 269, 640. Bibliotheca Cisterciencis, 393, n. 2.
Citeaux (Cistercium), 251, 252 and n. 1, 253, 324.
Clairvaux, 238, 254.
Clara of Assisi, 276.
Clarendon, assembly at, 170.
Classics, study of, 359, 362, 363, 374, 415, 530.
Claudius of Turin, 605.
Clement III., pope, 118, 120, 121, 129, 417. See Guibert.
Clement IV., pope, 289, 340, 424, 425, n. 1.
Clement V., pope, 70, 341.
Clergy, 205–215. Hildegard on the corruption of the, 219, 220. Abbot Joachim on the same, 222–224. Hostility between them and the mendicant monks, 97, 280, 286, 287. Ignorance of the, 287. Attacked by Henry of Cluny, 598, 599, 601. Dissatisfaction with, 96, 99, 100, 146–149, 599, 604, 610, 611, n. 3. Compare Celibacy, Marriage, Simony.
Clerici conductores, 206, n. 3.
Clerici regulares, irregulares, seculares, 208.
Clodona (Clonoda), town in Pommerania, 16.
Cluniacensians, 249–251, 263, 264.
Cluny, monastery, 77, n. 2, 238, 252.
Cluny, order of. See Cluniacensians.
Coadjutores, 215.
Colberg, history of its conversion, 16.
College, literary, under the Comnenes, 530.
Cologne, 74, 91, n. 1. Hermann, 79, 81. Albertus Magnus, 421, 422. Catharists near, 580, n. 1.
Commentaries on the Bible, 83, n. 2, 208, n. 1, 220, 221, n., 226, 228, 337, n. 4, 385, 408, n. 3, 411. On other books, 409, n. 1, 410, 416, 422, 445 and n. 1, 461, n. 5, 462, n. 1, 472, 480.
Communicatio idiomatum, in transubstantiation, 340.
Communion of infants, 341–343, 345; of the sick, 343, 345.
Community, impulse to, 233.
Community of goods, 208, 630.
Comnena, Anna, 559, n. 4.
Comnenus, Alexius, 559, 564.
Comnenus, Manuel, 529, 530, n. 1, 533–535, 560, 563, 564.
Comnenus II., 536.
Conception, immaculate, 331–333.
Concomitance, doctrine of, 344, 345.
Concordat of Worms, 143.
Confession, 347, 353. Catharists, 587, n. 5, 612.
Confessions of faith, 462, 516, 615, 616, n. 7, 631.
Confessors, 212, notes, 2, 3. Catharist, 582, n. 2.
Conon, legate, 382.
Conrad, priest, 279.
Conrad I., archbishop of Salzburg, 141, n. 1, 143, n. 6.
Conrad III., emperor, 151, 172.
Conrad IV., 610.
Conrad of Marburg, 643, 644.
Consilia evangelica, 283, 304, 414, 525, 526, 532.
Consolamentum, 571, 575–578, 581, 582, 590, 593. Reconsolatio, 581.
Consolati, 576, 585.
Constantia, mother of Frederic II., 176, 226.
Constantine, 159, 176. Pretended gift to pope Sylvester, 166, 172, 215, n. 3. Legends concerning, 163, n. 2, 216, n. 1.

Constantine Chrysomalos, 560–562.
Constantine Copronymus, 557.
Constantinople, Conference at (an. 1146), on questions in dispute between the Roman and Greek churches, 536–538. Latin empire at, 539.
Contemplation, — see Joachim.
Contemplation in God, 310.
Controversies, 371, 374. Bernard and Abelard, 393–400. Concerning faith and knowledge, 404. Concerning true love to God, 407. Gilbert and Bernard, 408, 409. In the Greek Church, 533–536. Greek and Latin churches, 536–551.
Conventicles, 323.
Conversion of masses, 17. See Force.
Corbeil, 373.
Corpus Christi day, 341.
Correzar, (Ozilia) island, 39.
Corruption of the Church, reactions against it, 146–152. See Sects.
Cosmas, patriarch of Constantinople, 564.
Councils, and papal absolutism, 195.
Councils and Synods. Trullan II., 334, n. 1. At Aix la Chapelle (an. 817), rule of Benedict of Aniane, 208. At Erfurt, ordinances of Gregory VII., 95, 96. At Rome (an. 1076), ban pronounced on Henry IV., 118. At Mentz, against Gregory VII., 118. At Brixen, against Gregory VII., 118. At Paris, ordinances of Gregory VII., 97, n. 8. At Soissons (an. 1093), against Roscelin, 360. At Rheims (an. 1094), against Yves of Chartres, 123. At Autun (an. 1094), ban against Philip, king of France, 123. At Clermont (an. 1095), ban pronounced anew, 123. At Placenza (an. 1095), Urban brings forward the Crusade, 125. At Bari (an. 1098), differences between the Roman and Greek churches, 458, 536. Lateran (an. 1112). See Lateran. At Soissons (an. 1121), against Abelard, 382, 383. At Troyes (an. 1127), rule of the order of Knights Templars, 258. At Pisa (an. 1134), Bernard and Innocent II., 146; Henry the Cluniacensian, 603. At Sens (an. 1140), Bernard and Abelard, 394, 409. At Constantinople (an. 1140), condemnation of Chrysomalos, 560. At Rheims (an. 1148), against Henry the Cluniacensian, 587, 604. At Pavia (an. 1160), Victor IV. recognized as pope, 167, 168. At Lombez [Lumbariense] (an. 1165), against the Catharists, 587, n. 5. At Constantinople (an. 1166), endemic synod under Manuel Comnenus, 534 and n. 4. At Scutari, on the oath prescribed to converts from Mohammedanism, 535. At Montpellier (an. 1208), against the sects, 269. At Beziers, against the sects; against abuses in the granting of indulgences, 353. At Paris (an. 1210), on the consecration of the host, 447, n. 3 (an. 1212); against the abuse of the mass, 346, n. 4. At Toulouse (an. 1229), against the translation of the Bible, and the reading of such translation by laymen, 324; establishment of the Inquisition, 642. At Lyons (an. 1245), against Frederic II., 183. At Bordeaux (an. 1255), communion of children, 342, n. 4. At Lyons (an. 1274), under Gregory X., the Crusades, 188. Albertus Magnus, 421; union consummated between the Greek and Roman churches, 546; against communities of "mendicants" existing without papal confirmation, 628. At Wurzburg (an. 1287), against the Apostolicals, 628, n. 1. At Chichester (an. 1289), against the Apostolicals, 628, n. 1. At Constantinople, against Beccus, 550. At Vienne (an. 1311), ordinance for the establishment of Professorships of the Oriental languages, 70. See Lateran.
Creation, doctrine of, 465–473, 481, 482. With the Bogomiles, 553, 554. Catharists, 566, 567, 572, 573.
Creatianism, 568, 573.
Cremona, 299.
Criticism, 520.
Cross, Sign of the, 14, 28, 29, 49. With the crusaders, 125–127, 154. Raymund Lull, 308. With the sects, 557, 594, 596, 598.
Cruko, Wendish prince, 32.
Crusades, 205, 233, 293, 591. In Liefland, 38. Against the Finns, 45. Occasion intercourse with the Mongols, 51; with the Mohammedans, 59. As affecting the Jews, 71, n. 3, 72. Bernard of Clairvaux, 73, 74. Design of Gregory VII., 104, 124. Victor III., 124. Urban II., 123–129. Eugene III., Bernard of Clairvaux, 153–157, 258. Innocent III., against John of England, 175. Honorius III., 177, 178. Gregory IX., 178. Frederic II., 178, 179. Against Frederic II., 179. Diminution of enthusiasm, reasons for and against, 188–192. Fulco, 210. Against the Albigenses, 270, 639, n. 2, 641. Of children, 342, n. 5. Indulgences connected with, 348, 349. Crusades and the Greek Church, 536, 538, 539. Gregory X., 544. Against the Apostolicals, 633. Against the Stedingers, 644.
Cubicularii, 196.
Culture, among the Nestorian clergy, 46, 52. In China, among the Mongols, 56. Worldly, 324. Abelard on, 376, 377. Peter Cantor, 414. Peter of Blois, 415. In the Greek monasteries, 529. In the Greek empire, 530. The Bogomiles, 559. Niphon, 563. See Education, Studies.
Cunibert, bishop of Turin, 98.
Curia Romana, 195–197. See Rome.
Curland, the conversion of, 38.
Cyprian, 100.

Cyprus, island of, 539 and n. 1, 540. Raymund Lull in, 68.

D.

Dalmatia, Apostolicals in, 631, 632.
Damiani, number of Sacraments, 334, n. 4.
Damietta in Egypt, siege of, 59.
Danes, 39.
Daniel, abbot of Schönau, 236, n. 2.
Dante, 637.
Dantzic (Gedania), Adalbert at, 41.
David, 624.
David, Jew, 445, n. 1.
David of Dinanto, 445–448.
De Causis, 445 and notes, 480.
Decretals, collection by Raymund à Pennaforte, 205 and n. 3.
Decretists, 204.
Decretum Gratiani, 204.
Demetrius, legate, 534.
Demmin, Pommeranian town, 18, 25.
Dendrites, 529.
Denmark, witchcraft in, 90, 91. Laity and clergy in, 100.
Desiderius, 575, n. 1.
Desiderius of Monte Cassino, 121.
Dialectic tendency, 33, 220, 227, 237, 355–357, 370, 371, 409. See Abelard. United with the practical, 400–411. In the thirteenth century, 416–420. United with the mystical, 419, 421.
Dictates, pretended, of Gregory VII., 120.
Didacus (Diego), bishop of Osma, 269, 641.
Diego. See Didacus.
Dieteric, bishop of Verdun, 84, n. 3, 86, n. 3, 109, n. 1, 119, 120, notes 2, 3.
Dionysius of Corinth, 382, n. 3.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 382, 420, 444, 479, n. 4.
Discussion of religious opinions, 374, 416, 621.
Dittmar, priest, 35, 36.
Divine right of princes, 109, 110, 141, 142, 165.
Docetism, of the Bogomiles, 554, 557. Catharists, 569, 570, 572, 574.
Doctrine, History of Christian. In the Western Church, 355–528. In the Eastern Church, 528–551.
Dodo, Franciscan, 278.
Dolcino, 629–638.
Dominicans, 268–270, 314, 421, 422, 618, n. 1. As missionaries, 56, 57. Suffragans, 215. Joachim, 221, n. Louis IX., 285, n. 7. Attacked by heretics, 610. Inquisitors, 643.
Dominick, 268–270, 641.
Domislav, father and son, Pommeranians, 9.
Domnizo, life of Mathilda, 112, n. 1.
Donum lachrymarum, 306.
Dschingiskhan (Temudschin), 49.
Dualism, 593. Of the Catharists, 562, 566, 567, 569, 570, 581, 582, 594. Euchites, 552. Bogomiles, 553. Western sects, 565. Eastern, 592.
Ducas Vatazes, John, 539.
Durand de Osca, 612, 613.

E.

Eadmer, monk, 366. Life of Anselm, 365, notes, 2, 4, 367, n., 368, notes.
East Frankland (Germany), 153.
Eastern Church, efforts for union with the Western Church, 104, 536–551.
Ebed Jesu, Nestorian metropolitan, 46.
Eberhard, archbishop of Salzburg, mother of, 295.
Eberhard, count, 92, n. 6.
Eberhard of Schönau, 579, 577–579 notes, 609, n. 2.
Ecbert, abbot of Schönau, 566, n. 2, 668, n. 2, 576, n. 4, 577, n. 1.
Ecclesiastical appointments, 200, 201, 206, 207. See Investiture.
Ecclesiastical laws, 131, 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 214, 395, 416. Collections, study of, 203, 204.
Eclecticism among the Mongols, 56.
Eclipse, 37.
Edessa, 153.
Education of the clergy, 3, 31, 45, 102, n. 4, 132, n. 4. Of children and youth, 3, 58. Anselm on, 362, 363. Eustathius, 532. See Culture, Schools.
Edward, prince of England, 188.
Egbert, bishop of Münster, 79.
El, 553, 555 and n. 1.
Elect, 554, n. 2, 615, 622. Manichean, 579, 581. See Predestination.
Elections, church, Gregory VII. and, 101 and n. 3.
Elfeg, archbishop of Canterbury, 329.
Elias, disciple of St. Francis, 275, 291.
Elijah, 266.
Elizabeth of Hessia, 302.
Elizabeth of Schönau, 217.
Emanation, 565.
Encodric, ecclesiastic, 21.
Endura, 582.
England, struggle between the secular power, and the church; à Becket, 169–172. John, 174–176. The Immaculate Conception, 331, 332, and n. 2.
Episcopi, in partibus infidelium, 215.
Equality, Christian, 40.
Eric, king of Sweden, 45.
Erigena, Scotus, 444.
Ermeland, bishopric, 45.
Ermenberga, mother of Anselm, 361.
Ernulph, bishop of Rochester, 344, notes 4, 6.
Eschatology, abbot Joachim, 222, 225–232, 617. Of the Franciscan Oliva, 621–626. Dolcino, 634, 635, 637.
Esthland, History of the conversion of, 38, 40, 41.
Euchites, 286, n. 3, 552 and notes 2, 3, 558 and n. 2.

Eudo, 604, n. 2.
Eugene III., pope, 151, n. 2, 152, 154, n. 4, 157, 160, 161, n. 3, 195, n. 1, 197, 199, 202, 214, 217, 251, 256, 257, 408, 409, 536, 587, 603.
Europe, spread of Christianity in, 1–45.
Eustathius, 529–533 and notes, 535.
Euthymius Zigabenus, 530. The Bogomiles, 552–559, notes.
Evangelical poverty, 268, 272, 276, 283, 291, 303, 594, 605, 608, 609, 616, 617, 624, 626.
Evangelium aeternum, 618.
Eve, 554, 555, n. 1, 573.
Everstein, castle, 33.
Evil, origin of, 474, 478–480. God's knowledge of, 476. Principle of, 553 Catharists, 567, 569, 570, 572.
Evolution, 445.
Excommunication. Compare Gregory VII. and Henry IV., 128, n. 4, 132, 219.
Exemptions granted by the pope, 201–203.

F.

Faith, Fides formata, 304. Fides precedit intellectum, Augustin, Anselm, 367, 369–371. Abelard, 379. Fides and intellectus. Bernard of Clairvaux, 371–373. Abelard, 373–380, 385. Bernard and Abelard, 396, 397. Walter à St. Victor, 381, 382. Hugo a St. Victor, 402–407. Gilbert de la Poree, 409. Peter of Blois, 415. Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, William of Paris, Roger Bacon, Raymund Lull, 427–440, 449, 450. Relation of feelings and knowledge to faith, 404–407, 427–429, 432–435. Faith a virtue, 433. Justifying faith; Fides informis, formata, 511, 512. Faith and works, 579.
Faldera (Wippendorf, Neumünster), a village of the Wends, 34.
Fall. See Sin. Original State.
Falsehood, 530, 615. See Fraus pia.
Fanaticism, 328.
Fast synods. Introduced by Gregory VII., 89, (an. 1074) 93, (an. 1075) 101, (an. 1076) 108. Against Frederic II., 178.
Fastings, 17, 28, 593, 616.
Fate, 476, 477.
Feeling, religious, 324.
Felix of Valois, 267.
Festivals. The Immaculate Conception, 331–333. Trinity, 334. Circumcision, 334. Fatuorum, follorum hypdiaconorum, 334. Corpus Christi, 341.
Festum. See Festivals.
Filius major, minor, 580.
Finns, history of the conversion of, 45.
Floris, monastery, 220.
Folmar, provost of Traufenstein, 345.
Fontevraud, (Fons Ebraldi) convent of nuns at, 247.
Force, used in extending Christianity, 1, 11, 12, 14, 31, n. 2, 36, 38, 39. See Spread of Christianity.
Forgiveness of sins, 615, 616.
France. Ordinances of Gregory VII. in, 94, 97, n. 8. Gregory VII. on the condition of, 102. Popes in, 144, 145, 152, 153, 157, 168, 183, 197. Pragmatic sanction, 203. Joachim, 224. Heretics in, 257, 369. Catharists in, 584, 586. Other sects in, 594–626, 639–643.
Francesco Pegna, 626, n. 3.
Francis of Assisi, among the Mohammedans, 59, 60 and n. 2. History and character, 270–276, 296, 311. Rule of, 290. See Franciscans. Oliva, 621, 624. Dolcino, 634.
Franciscans, 49, 57, 73. Orders of, 229, 268, 276, 290–292, 420, 424. Stricter and milder party, 291. Heretical tendency, abbot Joachim, 221 and n., 617–620. As missionaries among the Mohammedans, 60, 65. Doctrine of grace, 518. Attacked by Sectaries, 610.
Frangipani, 128.
Fratres, adscripti or conscripti, 238. Domus sanctae trinitatis, 268. Mendicantes, 276. Minores, 276. Ordinis tertii, 276. Poenitentiae, 276.
Fraus pia, 350, 631. Bogomiles, 558, 559.
Frederic I., archbishop of Cologne, 245, 592, n. 2.
Frederic I., emperor, 172. Arnold of Brescia, 147, n. 2, 148, n. 1, 161. Contest with the popes, 162–169, 171–173, 214, 220, 582, n. 4. University of Bologna, 203.
Frederic II., emperor. The Mongols, 49 Contest with the popes, 172, 176–185, 226, 325, 590, 610. Accusations against, 179–182, 418, n. 4.
Frederic of Celle, Cistercian, 39.
Free will, doctrine of, with the Scholastics, 485–487, 515–519. Catharists, 568, 569.
Freiburg, 421.
Friedland, fortress, 39.
Friends of God, 552.
Fulcher of Chartres, 126, n. 1, 129, n. 1.
Fulco, bishop of Toulouse, 270.
Fulco, preacher, 209, 210, 600.

G.

Gaiuk, khan of the Mongols, 51.
Gaston, founder of a society for the sick (Society of St. Anthony), 266.
Gaudentius, companion of Adalbert of Prague, 41, 42.
Gaunita, 442, 443.
Gazzari, 565.
Gebhard, archbishop of Salzburg, 96, 105, n. 4, 109, n. 3.
Geisa, king of Hungary, 88, n. 2.
Gelasius II., pope, 141, 245.
Gemel-ed-din, Mohammedan scholar, 181, n. 3.

General conceptions (universalia), 355, 356.
George, Tartar prince, 58, 59.
George Pachymeres, 533, n. 7, 544, notes 1, 2, 545, notes, 548–551, notes.
Georgius, patriarch, 551.
Gerhard, bishop of Angoulême, 145.
Gerhard, Franciscan, 618.
Gerhard, — see Segarelli.
Gerhoh (Geroch), abbot of Reichersberg, 83, n. 2, 86, n. 3, 94, n. 2, 98, n. 2, 100, n. 3, 101, n. 3, 110, n. 1, 133–157, notes, 155, 156, 157, 162, 163, n. 2, 168, n. 1, 195 and n. 1, 205 and n. 4, 206, n. 3, 208, 214, 313, n. 2, 345, n. 3, 407, 408, 410.
German knights, order of, 45.
Germanus, bishop of Adrianople, and patriarch of Constantinople, 543.
Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, 539.
Germany, spread of Christianity in, compare Pommerania, Prussia, Jews in, 73–76. Witchcraft, 91, n. 1. Ordinances of Gregory VII., 94. Assembly in, 117. Song, 155, 180, 188. Bishops, 214, 215. Heretics in, 609, 628, n. 1. Inquisition in, 643
Gerovit, war-god of the Pommeranians, 21.
Gift of tears, 306, 533.
Gifts, seven spiritual, 522.
Gilbertus Porretanus, 408, 410, 461, 462.
Gislebert, abbot, 78 and note.
Gnesen, 6. Archbishop of, and Prussian missions, 43–45.
Gnosis, compare faith. Relation to love, with Bernard of Clairvaux, 259, 260, 371–373.
Gnostics, Gnosticism, 507, 553, 556, 565, 567, 568, 571, 574, 593.
God. Doctrine of, in Scholasticism, 440–485. Ontological proof, 368 and n. 2, 440–442. Omnipresence, 450–452. Omnipotence, 452–457. Foreknowledge and predestination, 474–485 Raymund Lull on the knowledge of, 435–438. Causative principle, 449.
Goisfred, 294.
Gospel, of John, 576. Apocryphal, 553, notes 5, 6, 554, n. 1, 556 and n. 3, 558, 559, 566. The everlasting Gospel, 220, n. 2, 229, 230, 291, 618–620.
Gospels. The Catharists, 588.
Gottfried, abbot. Life of Bernard, 153, notes 2, 5, 156, n. 4.
Gottfried, duke, 85.
Gottfried, monk, 256, n. 4.
Gottfried of Beaulieu, 285, notes 4, 5.
Gottfried of Chartres, 198, 382, 393.
Gottfried of Lukina, Polish abbot, 43.
Gottfried of Vendome, abbot and cardinal, 121, n. 1, 128, 135, 142, 194, 247, 249.
Gottfried of Viterbo, 172, 215, n. 3.
Gottschalk, prince, converter of the Wends, 32.
Grace, doctrine of, 478, 485–495, 510–519. State of grace, 513–515. Freedom and grace, 515–519. Gratia operans, cooperans. 486, 487.
Gratian, monk, teacher of canonical law, 204.
Graticia (Garz ?), castle, 16, n. 1.
Great Sabbath, the, 551.
Greek church, its relation to the Latin, 528–551. See Eastern Church. Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, 458, 460, 536–538. Sects, 552–565.
Greek emperors, 533.
Greek language and literature, 378, 530.
Gregorius, cardinal, 144.
Gregory of Utrecht, 36.
Gregory the Great, 75, 317, n. 5, 396, 409.
Gregory VI., pope, 84,
Gregory VII., pope. Election, 82–86. Principles, 86–92. His name, 92, n. 4. Regulations and contest against simony and marriage of priests, 93–100, 146, 206, 293. Contest with Henry IV. respecting investiture, 2, n. 2, 4, 101–121, 134, 194, 233. Crusades, 123. Sigebert, 130. Excommunication, 132. Placidus, 140 and n. 1. Consecration of popes by consent of the emperor, 151. Oath of bishops, 200. Hugo of Cluny, 249. Doctrine of penance, 348.
Gregory VIII., pope, 141.
Gregory IX., pope, 76, 178–183, 188, n. 3, 205, 417, 539 and n. 2, 590, 643.
Gregory X., pope, 56, 188–192, 544, 628.
Gretser, 148, n. 3.
Gubbio, 206, n. 2.
Guenrich, scholastic writer, 109, n. 1.
Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna (Clement III.), 101, n. 2, 113, n., 118–129.
Guibert, of Nogent sous Coucy, 124, 125, n. 3, 127, notes 5, 6, 128, n. 1, 132, n. 4, 146, notes 2, 3, 234, 235, n. 1, 265 and notes 2, 3, 313, 314 and n. 1, 325, 329 and n. 3, 330 and notes, 586, n. 2, 587, n. 3, 591, n. 2.
Guido, brother of Bernard, 253, n. 1.
Guido, cardinal, 150, 151, 341. See Celestin II.
Guido, Cistercian, 640.
Guigo, prior of Carthusians, 413.
Guiscard of Cremona, 49.
Günther Ligurinus, 148, notes 1, 2, 149, n. 4.
Gützkow. History of the conversion of, 21–24.

H.

Halle, heretics at, 610.
Hamar, Saracen, 69, n. 2.
Hamersleben (abbey), 401.
Hartmann, master of the school at Paderborn, 33.
Hartwig, archbishop of Bremen, 35, 37.
Haymo, abbot, 86, n. 4.
Hebrew language, 425, 426.
Heinrich der Lette, priest, 39, notes, 40, n. 4, 41, n. 1.

Heisterbach, monastery, 155, n. 5, 239, n. 1.
Hell, 575.
Helmold, 33, n., 35, notes.
Heloise, 397, 400.
Henricians, 604.
Henry I., king of England, 364.
Henry II., king of England, 168, n. 2, 169–172.
Henry III., emperor, 89, 92, n. 6, 167.
Henry IV., emperor. The bishop Bernard, 2, n. 2. Otto of Bamberg, 4 and n. 2. Election of Gregory VII., 92, n. 6. Naumberg, 98, n. 1. Reconciliation, contest with Gregory, 103, n. 1, 103–121, 233, 303. Goes to Italy, 112–115. Contest with Gregory's successors, 129–132. Rebellion of his sons, 129 and n. 3, 133.
Henry V., emperor, 133–143. Joachim, 223, n. 3, 245.
Henry VI., emperor, 172, 173, 176, 223, n. 3, 226.
Henry, archbishop of Mentz, 74.
Henry, bishop of Speier, 92, n. 6, 99, n. 2, 113, n.
Henry, bishop of Upsala, 45.
Henry, son of prince Gottschalk, 32, 33.
Henry of Constance, 155, n. 5.
Henry of Ghent, 418, n. 3.
Henry the Cluniacensian, 597–604.
Henry the Lion, 32.
Heresy, Innocent III. on, 322. In the Greek church, 537. See Sects.
Heretical tendencies, in monasticism, 268, 269. See Franciscans.
Heretics, zeal of, 315. Punishment of, 604, 640 and n. 2. See Sects. Inquisition.
Herewald, 363.
Heribert, monk, 594, n. 2.
Heribert of Bosecham, 169, n. 3.
Herluin, abbot, 364.
Hermann, abbot, 357, n.
Hermann, bishop of Augsburg, 143, n. 5.
Hermann, bishop of Bamberg, 102, 103.
Hermann, bishop of Metz, 87, n. 4, 105, n. 4, 107, 109, n. 3.
Hermann, Jewish convert, 71, 72, 79–81.
Hermes Trismegistus, 461, 463, n. 7.
Hierarchy, 619. See Papacy.
Hildebert, archbishop of Mans, 134, 136, 140, n. 4, 141, 244, 247, 306, 343, n. 3, 401, n. 3, 599–602.
Hildebrand, 82. See Gregory VII.
Hildebrand, priest of Threida, 41.
Hildebrandian epoch, 205, 233, 592. Party, 140, 141, 149, 248. Principles, System, 143, 200, 205, 361, 364, 565, 593, 598.
Hildegard, 216–220, 225, 462, n. 4, 586.
Hildesheim, 421.
Hirsau, monastery, 233.
Hirschau, 86, n. 4.
History, Joachim on the periods of, 227–232.
Högelsdorf, monastery, 35.
Hohenstaufen, house of, 226 and n. 8, 582, 610.
Holm, in Liefland, 37.
Holy Spirit. The abbot Joachim on the, 227–232. Sect of the Holy Ghost, 447, 448. Opposition between the Latin and Greek churches concerning the, 536, 537, 540, 541, 544, 546, 549, 550. Age of the Holy Ghost, 617, 636–638. See Joachim, Franciscans, Apostolicals. Procession of the, Anselm., 458. Aquinas, 464. Bogomiles, 555 and n. 3. Catharists, 571. See Trinity.
Homage, 143.
Homily, 317, n. 5.
Honorius II., pope, 6, 199.
Honorius III., pope, 41, 177, 178, 270, 276, 341.
Honorius IV., pope, 65, 627.
Horses, sacred, 15 and n. 3, 37.
Host, 336. Worship of the, 341. See Lord's Supper.
Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, 123.
Hugo, Franciscan, 282.
Hugo, monk of Fleury, 141.
Hugo Blancus, 106, 107.
Hugo de Paganis, master of the order of Templars, 258.
Hugo of Cluny, 84, 86, 91, 92, n. 1, 114, 249.
Hugo of St. Caro (de St. Chers), 426, 618, n. 1.
Hugo of St. Victor, 327. Communion of infants, 342 and notes. Life and character, 386, 400–407, 408, 415. Omnipresence of God, 450, 452. Omnipotence of God, 455, 456. Trinity, 460. Foreknowledge and predestination, 475. Original state of man, 487. Sinlessness of Jesus, 496. His works, 401, n. 3.
Hulagu, khan of the Mongols, 56.
Humbert de Romanis, 189, 267, 314–317 and n. 5, 332, 582, 583, 584, n. 4, 589, n. 1.
Humiliates, 630.
Humility, with Bernard of Clairvaux, 262, 263. With Berthold, 320. Thomas Aquinas, 527.

I.

Iconoclasts, 557.
Ideas, the Divine; Raymond Lull, 481, 482.
Idols, destruction of, 3, 14, 15, 22, 29, 31, 32, 34.
Ignis purgatorius. See Purgatorial Fire.
Ignis Sacer, 266.
Image of God, 623. See Likeness.
Images. Image worship, 264, 307. Jews on, 77, 79. Joachim, 225. Innocent III., 317. Sects, 557, 594. Niphon, 564.
Incarnation, 451, 507, 508. See Redemption.
India. 57.
Indulgences, 125, 349–353, 640. Joachim

on, 222. The Troubadours, 604, n. 3. Sects, 610, 614.
Infant baptism, 593, 595, 601, 615.
Infants, communion of, 341–343, 345.
Infidelity, 431, 531. Of Frederic II., 179–182. See Unbelief.
Innocent II., pope, 75, 144–151, 153, 255, 503, 603.
Innocent III., pope. Mission in Prussia, 43–45. The Jews, 75, 76. His administration, 173–177, 178. Appeals, 199. Interpolated bulls, 204 and notes, 205. William Roskild, 206, n. 5. Plurality of benefices, 207. Vicarii, 212. Joachim, 221, n. Bernard, 253, n. 3. Collection of alms for Spitals, 267. Order of Trinitarians; law against the multiplication of monastic orders, 268. The sects, 269. Lateran council, 269, n. Order of Dominicans, 270. Francis of Assisi, 272. Franciscans, 277. Sermon on almsgiving, 306. As preacher, 317. Bible reading among the laity, 321–324. Doctrine of transubstantiation, 339, 340. Merits of the saints, 349, n, 3. Auricular confession, 353. Scholasticism, 411. Almaric of Bena, 446. Doctrine of redemption, 505, 506. Catharists, 582, n. 4, 583, n. 2. Waldenses, 609. Pauperes Catholici, 612, 613. Albigenses, 640. Punishment of heretics, 640 and n. 2. Peter of Castelnau, 641, n. 4. Inquisition, 643.
Innocent IV., pope. Embassy to the Mongols, 49–51. The Jews, 76. Frederic II., 183, 184. The begging monks, 282. Sects, 610.
Inquisition, 581, notes 6, 9, 582, 585, 614, notes 4, 5, 628, 629, 631, 640, 642–644.
Inquisitors, 643.
Insabbatati, 609.
Inspiration, Abelard, 376, 377, 391, 392, 496, n. 1. The Gnostics, 574, n. 1.
Institutions of benevolence, 214, 266–268, 294–296, 298, 299.
Intention, good, 308. Abelard on, 388–390, 392, 399, 528.
Intercessions, 547, 548; of saints, 593.
Interdict, 102, 174, 219, 582, 610, 640.
Interpolated writings, 221. See Bulls.
Interpreters, 6, 7, 17.
Intuition of God, Bernard, 371, 372. Richard de St. Victor, 411–413. Aquinas, 429.
Investiture, lay, 35, 36, 101–120, 133–143, 198.
Irnerius (Guarnerius), at Bologna, 203.
Isancios, 564, n. 2.
Israel, spiritual, 568.
Italy, sects in, 99, 582, 583, n. 2, 584 and n. 2, 585, 590, 613, 626–639.
Ivo (Yves) of Chartres, 121, 136, 137, 140, n. 3, 141, 194, 196, 198, 199, n. 1, 201, 203, 207, n. 2, 241, 347, 588, n. 2, 592, n 1.

J.

Jacob (James), king of Majorca and Minorca, 65.
Jacob and Esau, 589, n. 1.
Jacob of Vitry (à Vitriaco), 60 and n., 204, n. 4, 206, n. 5, 208, 209, n. 1, 210, notes, 211, 267, 413, 414.
Jago di Compostella, 298, 306.
Jehoschua Ben Meir, Jewish chronicle of, 74, n. 1.
Jerome, 424, 578, n. 5.
Jerusalem, 124–126, 130, 153, 155, 179, 189, 238, 307, 553, 555, n. 1.
Jesus, 554, 555. See Christ.
Jewish element, 59, 264, 553, 571, 590–592, 637.
Jews, situation of the. Polemics, conversion of, 71–81. Among the Mongols, 57. Majorca, Raymond Lull, 68. Persecution of, 71–77. False accusations against, 72, 73. Defended by Bernard, 73–75, 74, n. 1, 154. By the popes, 75–77. Influence of, 325, 326. Eustathius, 531, n. 5. Pasagii, 590–592. Oliva, 624.
Jezedaners, 558, n. 2.
Joachim, abbot of Floris, 135, 189, 216, 220–232, 244, 268, 291, 411, 447, 617, 618 and n. 1, 619, notes, 620, 625, 626.
Johann von Wintherthur, 318, n. 1.
Johannes Beccus, 545 and n. 2,–550.
John, apocryphal gospel of. See Gospel.
John, archbishop of Lyons, 136, 137.
John, associate of Peter Waldus, 606, n. 4.
John, count of Soissons, 325.
John, king of England, 174, 175 and n. 2, 182, 325.
John, legend of the Tartarian priest-king, 46, 47, 52.
John, son of George, Tartar prince, 58.
John, the apostle, 36. With the abbot Joachim, 227, n. 1, 227–229, 231. See Gospel, 381, 382, 434. With the Catharists, 570, 575 and n. 7. Oliva, 625.
John Cinnamos, 533, 534, n. 2, 563, notes 1, 3, 564, n. 1.
John Comnenus II., emperor, 536.
John de Lugio, 565.
John de Monte Corvino, 57.
John de Plano Carpini, 48, n. 2, 50, 51, n. 1.
John Ducas, 539, 541, 544.
John Eremita, the Second, 254, n. 2.
John Lascaris, 543.
John of Damascus, 550.
John of Fidanza, 421.
John of Matha, 267.
John of Paris, 340.
John of Parma, 618, n. 1.
John of Salisbury, 163, notes 1, 3, 168, n. 2, 169, notes 1, 4, 171, notes 2, 3, 194, 195, n. 2, 197, notes 1, 2, 205, n. 1, 211, n. 4, 237, n. 2, 357, 358 and notes 3, 4, 415.
John Parastron, 544.
John Peter de Oliva, 620–626.

John Philoponus, 461.
John Phocas, Greek monk, 266.
John Scotus Erigena, 444, 445, notes 1, 4.
John Strick, priest, 40.
John the Baptist, with the Catharists, 574, 575. Bogomiles, 556.
John Zimisces, 564.
John XXI., pope, 192.
John XXII., pope, 620, n. 3.
Joinville, memoirs of, 285, n. 4, 326, n. 3.
Jordanus, general of the Dominicans, 269, n. 1.
Joseph, patriarch, 543, 545, 546–551.
Joseph, prayer of, 568, n. 5.
Judas, 482.
Judgment, 621, 635. Threefold, Catharists, 571.
Judgments of God, 60, n. 2, 80, 86, 115, 550, 551, 588, 632.
Judith, 4, n. 1.
Judith, wife of Wladislav, 4.
Julin, Pommeranean town, 3, 9–11; bishopric, 16.
Jurisdiction, church, 83, 390. See Papacy.
Justice of God, 498, 506.
Justification, subjective mode of apprehending, in the Middle Ages, 304, 305. In Scholasticism, 508–510. Abelard, 502.
Justina, 111.

K.

Kaaba at Mecca, 535, n. 1.
Kammin, 9.
Kappenberg, monastery at, 71, 80, 81.
Kerait, Tartarian kingdom of, 46–48.
Kionites, 529, notes 1, 2.
Knights, 164, 233 577, n. 5. Order of German, 45. Spiritual, 38, 70, 191. Templars, 258. See Crusades. Bernard on spiritual knighthood, 258.
Knowledge, Bernard on, 241, 258, 259. Relation of the affections to, 411–413. In act and in habit, 443, 444. In God, Thomas Aquinas, 480. See Faith.
Koblaikhan, founder of the Mongol empire in China, 56, 57.
Kolberg (Colberg), history of the conversion of, 16.
Kulm, bishopric, 45.

L.

Laity, Gregory VII. and the, 94, 96, 97. Baptize, 99. Arnold, 149. Order of Laymen, 276. Piety among the, 294–304. Pious societies, 275, 302, 303. Bible among the, — see Bible. Bacon, 425. Wine in the Lord's Supper, 343–346. Relation to the clergy, 320, 354, 509, 514. Forbidden to dispute concerning the faith, 590. Separatist tendencies, 592. Reactions of the Christian spirit among the, 628.
Lamaism, 47, 56.
Lambert, 344, n. 4.
Lambert of Aschaffenburg, 91, n. 1, 92, notes 5, 6, 94, n. 4, 95, n. 1, 102, notes 4, 5, 103, notes, 105, n. 4, 106, n. 2, 113, n.
Landulph, 203, n. 2.
Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, 329, 355, 361, 362.
Langton, Stephen, cardinal, 174.
Language, of religious instruction, 4, 31, 52, 58, 62, 74, 214, 313, 314, 317 and n. 5, 318.
Languages, instruction in, 62, 63, 70, 190, 425.
Languedoc, sects in, 639 and n. 3–642.
Laon, 373.
Lascaris II., Greek emperor, 542, 543.
Lateran council, (an. 1112) 140, (an. 1123) 143, (an. 1139) 146, 150, (an. 1170) 608, 609, (1179) 169, 207, (an. 1215) 177, 199, 207, 212, 268 and n. 3, 269, n., 270, 284, 287, 335, 346, 353, 411, 588, n. 3, 642.
Lateran palace, 128.
Latin language, 58, 287, 314, 357, 359, 420, 444. See Language.
Law, influence of Christianity on, 40, 41. Study of, 203, 204, 415. See Ecclesiastical Law.
Laying on of hands, 562, 576, 577.
Legates, papal, 59, 89. Gregory VII., 94 Exactions of, 131, 164 and n. 4, 166, 167, 197, 200, 269. Innocent III., 173. Institution of, 89, 197, 198. Joachim on the, 222.
Legates a latere, 131.
Legists, 204.
Leo Allatius, 539, n. 1, 541, n. 2, 542, n. 3, 547, notes 1, 3, 563, notes 2, 3, 564, n. 3.
Leo IX., pope, 83, 97, 146, 223.
Leonis, cardinal, 144.
Leonists, 611.
Leprosy, 266, 267.
Letti, 40.
Liberty, 635, 642.
Libraries, 265, 279, n. 1, 393, n. 1, 399, n. 3, 529, 608, n. 1, 618, n. 1, 637, n. 1, 639, n. 1.
Liefland, History of the conversion of, 36–41.
Liege, 129. Canonicals of, 60. Letter of the clergy of, to Paschalis II., 130. Preaching of the Crusades in, 155, n. 5.
Life, Christian, 293–354.
Likeness to God, 485, 488, 491. Compare Original State.
Lisle, school at, 357.
Lithuania, pagan tribes in, 36.
Liturgy, 314.
Lockum, Cistercian monastery at, 37.
Logos, with the Bogomiles, 554, 557.
Lombardy, 117, 168, 179, 182,
Lombez, council at, 587, n. 5, 588.
London, despises the interdict, 176.
Lord's Prayer, 556, 576, 577, 627.
Lord's Supper, the; Transubstantiation: substance and accidents: under one

form: abuse in the mass, 335–347. Unleavened bread in the, 92, 538, 541, 614, n. 5. In the sects, 556, 559, n. 3, 576, 587, n. 5, 594, 596.
Lothaire II., 34, 35, 146, 164, n. 3.
Lothario of Anagni, cardinal, 173.
Louis the Pious, king of France, 133.
Louis VI., king of France, 140, n. 4, 145.
Louis VII., king of France, 75.
Louis IX., king of France (St. Louis), Embassy to the Mongols, 51, 55. On disputations with the Jews, 77, n. 2. The pragmatic sanction, 203. The begging monks, 281, 282, n. 1, 285 and notes 4, 5. Character, 300–302. Temptations to unbelief, 326. Thomas Aquinas, 423.
Love, doctrine of, compare faith. Bernard of Clairvaux, 257, 259–262, 263. Peter of Cluny, 264. Bernard of Tiron, 308. Raymund Lull, 309, 310, 436, 437. Richard à St. Victor, 310. Berthold, 319, 320. Anselm, 362, 367. Abelard, 386. Hugo a St. Victor, 407. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 407, 408. Alexander of Hales, 490. Bonaventura, 491. Eustathius, 533. Hildebert, 602. Dolcino, 633–635. In the period of the Holy Ghost; Joachim, 227. Otto, 21.
Love feasts, Catharist, 576, 587, n. 5. Peter of Savoy, 213.
Lubec, 33, 34.
Lubinum, (Lebbehn ?) 16, n. 1.
Lucas, bishop of Tuy, 584, n. 5, 585, n. 2, 591 and n. 1.
Lucius II., pope, 151, 152.
Lucius III., pope, 609.
Ludolf, companion of Vicelin, 33.
Lukina, monastery at, 43.
Lull. See Raymund.
Lund, bishop of, 164.
Luther, 232.
Lyons, discourse of Grosshead before the papal court at, 185.

M.

Majoralis, 614, n. 6.
Majorca, Raymund Lull in, 61, 63, 68, 71. Monastery for missionaries to the Saracens, 65. Saracens and Jews, 68.
Malachias of Armagh, 337.
Malek al Kamel, 59.
Malek al Moaddhem Isa, 60, n. 2.
Malilosa, Catharist festival, 566, n. 2.
Manasseh, archbishop of Rheims, 265.
Mandata, 200.
Mangukhan, 52–56.
Manicheans, 423, 558, 566 and n. 2, 567, 575, n. 4, 579–581, 587.
Mans, Henry the Cluniacensian at, 598–602.
Manuel Comnenus, 529, 530, n. 1, 533–535, 560, 563, 564.
Manuscripts, correction of, 362. Of the Vulgate, 426.
Marbod of Rennes, 247.
Marcesina, 541, 542, n 2.
Marcion, 574.
Marco Polo, 56, 57.
Margaret, Dolcino's female friend, 633.
Marianus Scotus, 445, n. 4.
Maris, Nestorian patriarch, 46.
Marriage, Otto, 8, 9. Of priests, in Normandy, 97, n. 8. Concubinage, 361. Gregory VII., 93–100. Sacredness of marriage maintained by Urban II., and Yves of Chartres, 121–123. A Christian marriage in the Middle Ages, 294, 295, 297. Ambrose of Sienna, 296. Eustathius, 531. Among the Catharists, 572, 579, 587, n. 5. Sect near Cologne, 593. Henry of Cluny, 600, 601, 603, n. 4. Dolcino, 633, 634.
Martin, cardinal, 198.
Martin of Tours, 312, 376.
Martin IV., pope, 548.
Martinus, Polonus, 445, n. 4.
Martyrdom, 191 and n. 3, 192, 242, 539, 540, 582 and n. 2, 589.
Mary, virgin, 38, 396, 608, 620. Worship of, Gregory VII., 86 and notes 3, 4, 87. Immaculate conception, 331–333. Bogomiles, 554, 557. Catharists, 570, 574, 569–571, 587.
Mass, for departed souls, 610. With the sects, 557, 559, n. 3, 594, 596, 612, 614 and n. 5, 615.
Mathilda, margravine of Tuscany, 86, 91 112, n. 1, 113 and note.
Matilda, queen of England, 90, 365.
Matins (matutina), 25.
Matter, 572.
Matthew of Paris, 72, n. 2, 73, notes, 175, notes, 176, n. 1, 178, n. 1, 180, 181–184, notes, 182 and notes, 183–188, notes, 187, notes, 277, 279, n. 4, 280 and notes, 281, notes 3, 4, 282, n. 3, 418, n. 4, 583, n. 2, 590, n. 6.
Mauritius. See Peter the venerable.
Mauritius, archdeacon, 211, n. 5.
Mayfreda, nun, 639.
Meinhard, converter of the Lieflandefs, 36, 37.
Melun, 373.
Mendicant orders, 272–292, 293, 420. Relations with the pope, 280.
Mentz, 74; archbishop of, 643.
Merit, 489, 490. Meritum de congruo, 519.
Messalians, 552, n. 2.
Metempsychosis with the Catharists, 568, 579.
Metz, societies at, 321–324.
Michael, archangel, 554.
Michael, patriarch of Constantinople, 563, 564.
Michael Nicetas, bishop of Athens, 531, notes 1, 3.
Michael Paleologus, 533, n. 7, 542, 544, 546–548, 551.
Milan, sects at, 613, 638.
Milano Sola, 632.
Military service, 614. O' bishops, 31 and n. 2, 200.

Milo Crispin, 329, n. 1.
Ministri sacri palatii, 196.
Minorites, 221, n., 276.
Miracles, 26, 27, 32, 76. Egbert on, 80. Fraudulent, 127, 529. Bernard of Clairvaux, 146, 256 and n. 4, 257, 603. At Becket's tomb, 171. Fulco, 210. Norbert, 245, 246. Love of the wonderful in the Middle Ages, significance of the miracle, 312. Stories of miraculous cures, 328, 329. Abelard, 377, 378. Cessation of, 468, 469, 551. Doctrine of with the Scholastics, 466–474. Bogomiles, 557. Niphon, 564. Catharists, 569, 570, 584. Waldenses, 615.
Miranmolin, king of Tunis, 436.
Mizlav, Pommeranian governor, 22–24.
Mohammed, 637.
Mohammedans, 178, n. 4, 531, n. 5. In Spain, see Spain. Among the Mongols, see Mongols. Favor the Nestorians, 45, 46. Mission among them, 59–71, 465. And Frederic II., 180, 182. And the Greek church, 535, 536.
Monasteries, founding of, 5. Worldliness of, 234. Seats of education, 239, 249. Decoration of, 252. Splendor of, 264. Greek, property of, 529, 530.
Monastic orders, 244–292. See Dominicans, Franciscans, Monks.
Moneta, Dominican, 566–579, notes, 583, n. 4, 589, n. 2.
Mongols. Relation to Christianity, 48–57. The Mohammedans, 51. Joachim, 221, n.
Monism, 444, 445, 446–449, 474, 481, 566. See Pantheism.
Monks. Monasticism. As missionaries, 1, 2, 5 and n. 3, 39, 49, 56, 57, 60. Clergymen, 39. Support Gregory VII., 97, 98. In the Crusades, spiritual order of knights, 126, 127. The popes, 168, 281, 640. Exemptions, 201, 202. Zeal for monasticism, 205, 358. Joachim, 220, 225, 228. Reformatory impulse proceeding from, 232, 233. History, 232–292. Bernard on, 258. Great influence, 280, 281. Hugo, 401. In the Greek church, 528–530, 532. Persecuted, 539. Bogomiles among, 563. Dolcino, 635. Inquisitors, 640, 643. See Franciscans.
Montanism, Abelard, 375.
Monte Cassino, monastery, 85, n. 1, 120, 421.
Moon, with the Catharists, 572.
Morals, Abelard, 386–390, 398, 399. The Scholastics, 488, 519–528. Catharists, 579.
Moritz, bishop of Paris, 325.
Moses, 554, 573, 574, 590.
Moslesme, forest of, 251, 252.
Mystics, 411–416, 516, 517. Mystical theology, 220, 227, 231, 232. Mystical tendency, 283, 371–373, 374. See Francis of Assisi. In the thirteenth century, 419, 447, In the Greek church, 552. Bogomiles, 557. Chrysomalos, 561 562. Niphon, 563. See Dialectic.

N.

Naples, university at, 421, 422.
Naugard, 16, n. 5.
Nazarius, bishop of the Catharists, 566.
Nechites (Nicetas), archbishop of Nicomedia, 536–538.
Necromancy, 594.
Neo-Platonism, 444, 445 and n. 1, 449, 523.
Nequinta, pope of the Catharists, 590.
Nero, 226.
Nestorians, missionary labors of, 45–48, 51. Favored by Mohammedans in Persia, 56. Among the Mongols, 51, 52, 57–59.
Netze, river, 7.
Neumünster, 34, n. 1.
New Testament, 405, 602, 609.
Nice, 542. Council of, 537.
Nicene creed, 537.
Nicephorus Blemmydes, 541–543, 546.
Nicephorus Gregoras, 542, notes 4, 5, 544, n. 1, 545, n. 2.
Nicetas, bishop of Chonae (Colosse), 530 and n. 1, 533, n. 8, 534, n. 3, 535, notes, 564, n. 2.
Nicetas, bishop of Nicomedia. See Nechites.
Nicholas I., pope, 90, n. 6.
Nicholas III., pope, 291, 591, n. 2.
Nicholas IV., pope, 628.
Nicholas, bishop of Methone, 530.
Nicholas, English monk, 331, 332.
Nicholas, patriarch of Constantinople, 560.
Nicholas de Pistorio, 57.
Nicholas Eymericus, 618, n. 1, 626, n. 3, 628, n. 2.
Nicholas Peraldus (Pérault), archbishop of Lyons, 519.
Nigellus Witeker, monk, 265, n. 4.
Niphon, monk, 563 and n. 4, 564 and n. 2.
Nivard, brother of Bernard of Clairvaux, 253, n. 1.
Noble lesson, The, 616 and n. 7.
Nominalism, 356, 359, 360, 369, 461, 462, n. 4.
Non-residence, 207. See Absentees.
Norbert, founder of the Premonstratensians, 208, 244–246, 312, 592, n. 2.
Novem-populonia, 565.

O.

Oaks, sacred, 15.
Oath, in the contest between Gregory VII. and Henry IV., 102–110. Paschalis II., 131, 139–141. Among the sects, 587, 588, 612, 614, 631 and n. 2.
Obedience, monastic, Bernard on, 255 Dolcino, 635, 636.
Oblati, 234, 251.
Oblatio, 196.

Obscurantes, 98 and n. 1.
Octavian, cardinal, 167.
Odo of Tournay (Udardus), Scholastic, 357, 358, 359, n. 3, 493.
Offerings for the dead, 597.
Offices, ecclesiastical, among the Waldenses, 614, 616.
Officiales, 212, 213.
Οἰκονομία, 549.
Old and New Testament, 567. Hugo, 405, 406. Periods; Joachim, 227, 228. Old Testament, with the Jews, 77, 81. Gregory VII., 86. Greek sectaries, 563. Catharists, 571, 573.
Oldenburg, 35.
Oliva, monastery, 43.
Olof, king of Norway, 90.
Opus operatum, 224, 225, 306–312, 387.
Ordeal, 80, 115, 588, n. 6.
Ordericus Vitalis, 92, n. 5, 236, n. 1, 252, notes 1, 2, 254, n., 263, n. 3.
Orders, monastic, 244–292. Jealousies between, 263. Multiplication of, 268.
Ordo dominarum pauperum, 276.
Ordo fratrum militiae Christi, 38.
Ordo minorum, 221, n.
Ordo predicatorum, 270.
Oriental Church, 68, 86. See Eastern Church.
Origen, 351, 453, 618.
Original righteousness, 492.
Original sin, immaculate conception, 331–333. Fomes peccati, 332, n. 1. Scholastics, 491–495. Richard a St. Victor, 517. Catharists, 572, 573.
Original state of man. The Scholastics, 485–495.
Osbern, 363.
Otho III., emperor, 43. Othos, 133, 167.
Otho, duke of Saxony (Otho IV, emperor), king of Rome, 176, 177. Emperor, 582, n. 4.
Otto, bishop of Constance, 94, n. 3, 96.
Otto, bishop of Freisingen, 129, n. 1, 147–151, notes, 155.
Otto of Bamberg, 2, n. 1, 3–30, 130.
Otto of Ostia, 121.
Outward works, forms, 264, 302, 304, 305–312, 348, 561, 562.
Ovid, 448.
Oxford, university of, 70, 408.

P.

Pachymeres. See George.
Paderborn, school at, 33.
Padua, 421.
Paganism. Condition of, 11. Reactions of, 17, 25–28, 37. Pagan festivals, 334.
Palenza, Spanish university at, 268.
Palmaris of Placenza, 297, 303.
Pantheism, 275, 431, 444–450, 480, 618.
Papacy, History of the, 82–197. Papal elections, 169 and n. 2, 192. Papal system, 194–197. Distinct branches of the papal church government, 197–205. Bernard on the, 158–160. Abbot Joachim on the corruption of the papacy, 222–226. Papal authority, Bernard on the, 255, 256. Downfall predicted, 187, n. 2, 202. See Popes, Prophecy.
Papellards, 285, 286, 303.
Paraclete, 571.
Paris. See Councils. University of, 3, 33, 70, 173, 210, 211, 282, 283, 289, 340. Sorbonne, 303. Scholasticism, 357. Life there, 413 and n. 7, 414, 417. Raymund Lull at, 63, 70. Fulco, 209. Abelard, 373, 383. Albertus, 421. Aquinas, 422. Almaric, 446. Catharists, 583. The eternal gospel, 619. Convention of the Franciscan order (an. 1292), 621.
Parma, 626 and n. 4, 627–629.
Pasagii, 590.
Paschalis II., pope, 2, 129–141, 142, 147, 196, n. 2, 223, 252, 345.
Paschalis III., pope, 168.
Paschasius, Radbert, 345.
Patarenes, 99, 225, 226, 565, 592.
Paul, the apostle, 132, 136, 172, 250, 283, 376, 377, 379, 405, 424, 428, 475, 516, 554, 561, 569, 570, 576. Abbot Joachim, 227–229.
Paulicians, 552, 564, 565, 567.
Paulitzky, Polish commandant, 7, 8, 10.
Pauperes Catholici, 612.
Pauperes Christi, 247.
Pauperes de Lombardia, 609.
Pauperes de Lugduno, 609.
Pelagianism, 390, 485, 488, 493, 510, 523.
Penance, sacrament of, 285, n. 4, 347–354, 390. Three parts of, 347. Catharists, 577, 587, n. 5.
Peraldus, 519.
Perfecti, 576, n. 2, 579.
Perfects, among the Catharists, 576 and n. 2, 579–581, 584, 585.
Perigueux, sect at, 594.
Persecution. In Pommerania, 10. Liefland, 38. Of Greeks by the Latins, 539. In the Greek church, 546. Of Bogomiles, 559, 560. Catharists, 589, 590. Of Apostolicals, 628, 630–633. Of heretics, 640–644. Bernard, Hildegard, Peter Cantor on, 586, 587.
Persian church under the Mongol rule, 49, 56 57.
Peter, the apostle, 132, 139, 159, 161, 165, 175, 176, 194, 215, 376, 377, 424, 482, 540. With Joachim, 227–229, 231. Gregory VII., 83, n. 3. Church of, 157.
Peter Bernard, abbot (Eugene III.), 152.
Peter Cantor, 202, 204, n. 1, 207, 209, 212 and notes 2, 3, 304 and n. 2, 346, n. 2, 414, 587, 588, 604, n. 2. Character, 414.
Peter de Bernadone, 270.
Peter de La Celle, 331, 332, 488.
Peter de Lucalongo, 58.
Peter de Oliva, 620.
Peter de Rusia (de Rossiaco), 211.
Peter de Vineis, chancellor, 180.

Peter Leonis, cardinal, 142, n. 3, 144.
Peter Lombard. Method of, 204. Doctrine of penance, 347, 353. Character. School, 409–411. Thomas Aquinas, 422. Sentences, 437. Being of God, 462. Doctrine of man's original state, 487. Original sin, 495. Sinlessness of Jesus, 496. Doctrine of atonement, 505. Justifying faith, 511.
Peter of Amiens, 124, 125, 154.
Peter of Blois, 169, n. 4, 196, n. 2, 199, n. 1, 201, n. 4, 202, 204, n. 1, 205, n. 1, 207, n. 1, 212, 415 and n. 7.
Peter of Bruis, 595–597, 598, 602, 604.
Peter of Castelnau, 641 and n. 4.
Peter of Cluny (Mauritius), 75, 144, 194, 238, 242, 246, 249–251, 259, 263, 328, 400, 595, 597, 602, n. 5, 603. Character, 249–251.
Peter of Lugio, 635, notes 1, 2, 636.
Peter of Morone, 193.
Peter of Moustier en Tarantaise, 213.
Peter of Poictiers, 410, 487.
Peter of Vaux-Sernai, 640, n. 1.
Peter of Verona, Dominican, 585, n. 1.
Peter the Hermit. See Peter of Amiens.
Peter the Venerable, 249. See Peter of Cluny.
Peter Waldus, 606, 607, 609.
Petrobrusians, 595 and n. 2, 596, 602, n. 5, 604. See Peter of Bruis.
Phalet, convert, 43.
Philip I., king of France, 97, n. 8, 102, 121.
Philip, companion of Christian, 43.
Philip, companion of Gottfried of Lukina, 43.
Philip, duke of Suabia, 176, 582, n. 4.
Philip Augustus, king of France, 175.
Philip of Limborch, 580, 614, 631, n. 2, 635, notes, 1, 2.
Philippopolis, in Thrace, 564.
Philo, 568, n. 5.
Philoponus, 461.
Philosophy, study of, 415. Relation to theology, 432, 435, 474. Roger Bacon on, 425, 434, 435. Moral and speculative, 434. Faith and, 450. See Aristotle, Plato.
Phocas, emperor, 530.
Photius, 547.
Pictures, 58, 79, 163 and n. 3, 164 and n. 3, 165, 307. Bernard on, 264.
Piedmont, Waldenses in, 609.
Pierre de Beres, knight, 577, n. 5.
Pilgrimages, 164, 237, 238, 276, n. 2, 297, 298, 306, 307, 578, 638.
Pilichdorf, tract of, 605, n. 1, 606, n. 4, 614, n. 3.
Pisa, Raymund Lull at, 69, 70, 190. Papal court at, 198.
Placenza, Raymund Palmaris at, 297–299.
Placidus, 137–139.
Plato, Platonism, 356. Abelard, 379, 384, 467. Platonic philosophy in the thirteenth century, 419, 420. See Neo-Platonism.
Platonists, 420.
Plays, spiritual, 39.
Pleroma, 571.
Pliny, 535, n. 1.
Plotinus, 445, 523, 524, n. 1.
Plurality, 207.
Polemics, against Mohammedans, Raymund Lull, 61–71. Against Jews, 77–81.
Poles, Christianity among the, 1, 3, 4.
Poli, merchants of the family of the, 56, 57.
Polygamy, among the Pommeranians, 8, 9. Nestorians in Tartary, 52.
Pomesanien, bishopric, 45.
Pommerania, 1–31. Manners of the Pommeranians, 11.
Pontius, abbot of Cluny, 249, 345.
Popes, connection with missions, 43, n. 1, 56. See Innocent III., Innocent IV. Conduct towards Jews, 75. Consecrated by consent of the emperor, 151. Coronation of emperors, 119, 120, 164 and n. 3, 177. Election of, 177. Abdication of, 193, 194. In France, 144, 145, 152, 153, 157, 168, 183–185, 197. Journeyings of, 197 and n. 4. Predictions of Joachim, concerning the, 223, 224. Property of the mendicant orders, 291. In the Greek Church, 538–541, 544, 546. Relation to the period, 600. Attacked by Sectaries, 610. William of St. Amour, 619. Dolcino, 636 and n. 3. See Papacy.
Portiuncula, 272.
Potho of Prüm, 331, 333, n. 6.
Praedicatores, 221, n.
Pragmatic Sanction, 203.
Prague, library at, 279, n. 1.
Prayer, 26, 27, 28, 80, 81. Bernard of Clairvaux on, 241, 260, 261. Francis of Assisi, 273, 274. Praying brothers and sisters, 286. Raymund Lull, 309. For departed souls, 594, 597. Waldenses, 616.
Preaching. Otto of Bamberg, 4. Grosshead, 186. Preachers of repentance, 208–211, 238, 239, 246–249, 293, 313, 598–604, 627. Raymund Lull on, 242, 310. Francis of Assisi, 273, 274. Guibert of Novigentum, 313, 314. Humbert de Romanis, 314–317. Innocent III., 317. Thomas Aquinas, 317, 422. Berthold, 318–320. Catharists, 584. See Dominicans, Begging Monks.
Preces, precistae, 200.
Predestination. Belief in the Middle Ages, 474–485. Catharists, 568.
Premonstratensians, 80, 244–246.
Premonstre (Praemonstratum), 245.
Presents, used in introducing Christianity, 6, 13, 18, 49, 50.
Priesthood, universal, 592, 609, 614.
Priests, sons of, 97, n. 8, 361.
Primitive Christianity, 563, 621, 623.
Privilegium, papal, 202.
Proclus, 445, n. 1.
Property, of the mendicant orders, 291. Renunciation of, 594. Of Greek mo-

nasteries, 529, 530. See Evangelical Poverty, Mendicant Orders.
Prophecy, interpretation of. See Joachim. Franciscans. Apostolicals, 632.
Prophetic element, 216.
Prophets, Bernard on the, 258. Catharists, 574.
Prophets in the Middle Ages, 215–232, 226, n. 3, 617, 625, 632. Anselm, 368. Hugo, of St. Victor, 405, 406. Compare Inspiration.
Protestant principle, 578, 595. Protestantism, 639.
Provence, Henry of Cluny in, 602.
Providence, 477.
Prussians, history of the conversion of the, 41–45.
Psalmody, church, 58.
Pseudo Dionysian writings, 420, 444.
Pseudo Isidorian decretals, 203.
Publicani, 565.
Punishment, 498. Of heretics, 604, 640 and n. 2. Of death, 614.
Punzilovo, Armanno, 585.
Purgatorial fire, 348, 350, 594, 614.
Puy Lorent, Chronicle of, 577, n. 5.
Pyritz, town in Pommerania, 7, 9, 10, 16.

R.

Rabbanta, Nestorian monk, 48.
Radulf (Rudolph), monk, persecutor of the Jews, 74, 75.
Radwic, historian, 164, n. 3.
Raimbert, of Lisle, 357, 359, n. 3.
Raimund, Count of Toulouse, 641.
Rainaldi, 541, n. 1, 590, n. 2.
Rainer, Cistercian, 640.
Rainer, Dominican, 326.
Rainerio, Sacchoni, 571, n. 2, 576–582, notes, 579, 581, 587, n. 4, 588, n. 1, 605, n. 1, 606, n. 4, 611.
Ratherius, 208.
Rationalistico-pantheistic party, 230.
Rationes causales, seminales, 470–472.
Raymund de Palmaris, 297–300, 303, 607, n. 2.
Raynund de Pennaforte, 63, 205.
Raynund Lull, 61–71. Life of, 61, n. 1, 66, n. 1. Universal Science, Ars magna, Ars generalis, 62, 65, 67, 427, 437. Tabula generalis, 67, n. His works, 68, n. 1, 90, n. 3. On the conversion of the heathen and the Crusades, 190–192. On the eremitic life, 242. On hypocritical monks, 244. External works and love, 307–311. The cross, 308. The immaculate conception, 333. Transubstantiation, 336, n. 1. Necessity of scientific education for missionaries, 426, 435, n. 2. His importance in systematic theology, 426, 427. Fides and ratio, 435–440. Trinity, 465. Miracles, 473. Foreknowledge and predestination, 481–485. Incarnation, 508. Fides formata, 512. Ethics, 519.
Raynald de Bergamo, 629, n. 4.
Reactions, reformatory, 82. Against the church system, 140, 146, 147, 592, 605, 628. Called forth by the zeal of the heretics, 315. Of unbelief, 324–328. From religious enthusiasm, 239.
Realism, 356, 357, 359, 461, 462, n. 4, 492.
Reason, and Faith, 412, 415, 417, 429–431, 434, 435, 440. Common and particular, 444.
Redemption, doctrine concerning. Scholastics, 497–508. In the sects, 554, 555, 562, 568, 569.
Reformation, premonitions of the, 216, 318, 592. Of Science, Bacon on the, 424, 425.
Reformatory tendencies, 82, 205, 594, 595, 605. See Gregory VII.
Regalia, 134. Investiture with, 143, 147.
Regensburg, 421.
Regino of Prüm, 203.
Relics, 28. Veneration of, 210, 238, 330.
Religio (monasticism), 284.
Repentance, doctrine of, Abelard, 390. Catharists, 571.
Resurrection, Catharists on the, 571, 575, 587.
Revelation, Periods of, with Joachim, 227–231. Supernatural, Thomas Aquinas, 429, 430. Dolcino, 631.
Reward, 260, 407, 408.
Rheims, school at, 265.
Rhine, sects in the countries on the, 582, 609, 643.
Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, 201.
Richard of St. Victor, 293, 305, 310. Character, 411–413. On the Trinity, 460, 461. Free will, 517.
Richer, Benedictine, 290, n. 1.
Richmar, ecclesiastic, 79.
Riga, 39, 40.
Rigord, 210, n. 2, 211, n. 2.
Robert, count of Flanders, 129, 130.
Robert de Sorbonne, 303.
Robert Grosshead (Grouthead, Capito), bishop of Lincoln, 185–187, 200, 207, 278, 280, 281, n. 3, 424. His writings, 185, n. 1.
Robert Guiscard, 120.
Robert of Arbrissel, 243, 246–249, 600.
Robert of Citeaux, founder of the Cistercian order, 251, 252.
Robert Pullein, 349, n. 2, 408. Doctrine of the original state of man, 486. Doctrine of atonement, 505. Free will, 515.
Roger, count of Foix, 642.
Roger, duke of Sicily, 364.
Roger, king of Sicily, 144, 146, 157, 364.
Roger Bacon, Nominalism and Realism, 356, n. 1. Character, 423–436. Theology and philosophy, 434, 435. Miracles, 474.
Roland, legate, 164, 167. See Alexander II.
Roland of Parma (Eberhard), 107.
Roman curia, 185, 187, 196, 198, 199, 222, 256.
Roman de la Rose, 289, n. 2.

Roman law, study of, 172, 203, 204.
Roman republic, empire, restoration of the, 151, 161.
Rome, synod at, under Gregory VII. (an. 1080), against Henry IV., 118. Against Frederic II. (an. 1241), 182. Compare Fast synods. Assembly under Henry IV., against Gregory VII., 120. Siege of, by Henry IV., 119. Frederic I., 163, 166. Influence of Arnold of Brescia at, 150–152. Commotions at, 151, 152. Senate, 151, 161. Frederic II., 176, 182, 183. Corruption at, 185, 187 and n. 2, 195, 196, 604, n. 3.
Romish Church. Compare Western Church, Papacy. Abbot Joachim on the, 222–226. Attacked by the Waldenses, 611. Dolcino, 636. Arnold Hot, 641.
Ronca, diet of, 203.
Roscelin, 247, n. 4, 356, 359, 360, 361, 369, 382, 461.
Rudolph, abbot of Liege, 343, n. 4. Compare Averrhoes.
Rudolph, companion of Vicelin, 33.
Rudolph of Suabia, 96, n. 6, 117, 118, 119.
Rügen, history of the conversion of, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32.
Rufinus, 423.
Ruits (priory), in Brittany, 383.
Rupert, convent, 217.
Rupert of Bamberg, 109.
Rupert of Deutz (Tuitiensis), 79, 337, n. 6, 338, 411, 487, n. 5.

S.

Sabellianism, 227, n. 1, 461, 462, n. 2, 556.
Sabôtiers, 609.
Sacraments, administration by simoniacal and married priests, 94, 100. During the interdict, 174. Joachim on the, 224, 225. Innocent III., 322. The seven, 8, 334, 335, 614. Doctrine of the, 334–354. With the followers of Almaric of Bena, 448. In relation to grace, 514. Of the Old and New Testament, 514, n. 5. With sectaries, 556 and n. 2, 557, 575–578, 593. Chrysomalos, 561.
Sacred poetry, 155, 313. See Song.
Saints, worship of, 328–333, 638. The Jews on, 77. Bogomiles, 557. Henry of Cluny, 601, 602. Waldenses, 614.
Salamanca, University at, 70.
Salimbenus de Adam, 626, notes 3, 5, 627, n. 1.
Samaritan, the good, 572.
Sameland, Adelbert in, 42. Bishopric, 45.
Sammael, 553, n. 1.
Samson, archbishop of Rheims, 587, 604.
Sanctification, 510.
Saracens, 624. Among the Mongols, 53, 57. Raymund Lull, 62–71, 190–192. In Majorca, 68. In the East, 104, 124, 153, 189, 190. In N. Africa, 124. Grenada, 191. Anselm, 364.
Sartach, Mongol prince, 51.
Satan, in the doctrine of atonement, 500, 501, 503, 506. Joachim, 226. Anselm, 486 and n. 4. Bogomiles, 555 and n. 1. Catharists, 567–569, 572–575.
Satanael, 553–556.
Satisfaction, doctrine of, Anselm, 499, 500, 501, 506. Abelard, 501, 502. Vicarious, 505. Aquinas, 506. William of Paris, 506, 507. Ecclesiastical, 593.
Saul, 624.
Saxo Grammaticus, 31, n. 2, 32, n. 1.
Scholasticism, 355–528, 549. Method of, 420.
Schools, 3, 33, 34, 45, 65, 143, n. 5, 239, 265, 356–359, 362, 374, 421, 422, 530. Linguistic, 63, 65, 70.
Schwartzach, monastery, 103.
Science, relation to missions, 61–71, 426, 435, n. 2, 436. Roger Bacon on, 434, 435. Scientific tendency, 234, 253, 258, 281. Bogomiles, 559. See Faith.
Scriptures, Holy, Hildegard on the, 218. Joachim, 227–231. Letter and spirit, 232. Peter of Cluny, 251. Bernard, 258, 259. Bacon, 424, 425. In the sects, 594, 601, 604, 607. See Bible.
Sects, 269, 324, 336, 447, 448. Originating in the East, 552–592. In the West, 592–644. Origin of the, 552, 565, 590–594.
Secular business of bishops, 133, 214. Abbots, 364. Secularization of the church, 215, 592. See Joachim.
Segarelli, 626–629, 631.
Segeburg, 34, 35. Monastery at, 36.
Senglier, archbishop, 394.
Sentences, 409, 410, notes 1, 2, 422, 425, 437, 472, 492. Sententiaries, 417. Of Pullein, 408, n. 4. Of Abelard, 422 and n. 7, 455, n. 3. Waldenses, 607.
Sermon, the, 247, 313, 314.
Sermon on the mount, 574, 587, 615.
Sex, 445, n. 4.
Sibyls, 379.
Sicilies, the two, united with the empire, 173. Sicily, 548.
Sick, care of the, 5, 213, 267, 294 296, 299. Communion of the, 343, 345.
Sigebert, of Gemblours, 99, notes 3, 4, 120, n. 5, 130, 266, n. 4.
Sigfrid, archbishop of Mentz, 94–96, 102 109.
Sigfrid, monk, 39.
Siggo, pagan priest, 42.
Sighard of Aquileja, 111.
Signy, Cistercian abbey at, 393.
Silvester, bishop of Rome, 132, 634, 635, Gift of Constantine, 152, 166, 172, 215, n. 3. Legends concerning, 16, n. 2, 216, n.
Silvester II., pope, 43, 104, 123.
Simon, monk, 235.
Simon Magus, 226.
Simon of St. Quentin, 49, n.
Simon of Tournay, 418, and notes 3, 4.

Simony, 93, 103, 196, 222, 246, 346. See Gregory VII.
Sin. The fall, Abelard. 389, 390. Scholastics, 492–497. Peccatum naturale and personale, 493. Posse non and non posse peccare, 495, 496. Passio and propassio, 497. See Redemption.
Sina (China), 46.
Sinibald of Anagni (Innocent IV.), 183.
Skepticism, 239 and n. 2, 324–328. Skeptical tendency in nominalism, 356, 357, 359, 360.
Slavic populations, history of their conversion, 1–45.
Slavoni, 565.
Societies, Spiritual, 34, 302, 303, 612, 613, 627, 628, 631.
Society Islands, 17.
Socinians, 450.
Socrates, 379.
Sodrach, a convert, 43.
Song, sacred, 40, 42. German, 155, 188, National, 180.
Soothsayers, 55, 359, n. 3, 462, n. 4.
Sophia, sister of Henry IV., 4.
Sorbonne, the, 303.
Soterich, Diaconus, 533, n. 9.
Spain, feof of the Roman Church, 88. Saracens in, 191. Waldenses, 613.
Spier, 74.
Spiritales, 228, 230, 617
Spitals, 267.
Ssanang Ssetzen, 46, n. 1.
St. Angelo, castle of (Domum Crescentii), 120, 128, 129.
St. Bernard, mount, 214.
St. Blasen, monastery of, 233.
St. Denis, abbey of, 374, 382.
St. Dominick, monastery of, at Pisa, 69, n. 2.
St. Evreul, monastery, 92, n. 5.
St. Marcel, priory of, 400.
St. Salvator, cloister in Schaffhausen, 233.
St. Sophia, church of, 534, 555, n. 1.
St. Victor, foundation of canonicals at Paris, 401, 410–414.
Stars, with the Catharists, 572, 575
State of grace, 513–515.
Stedingers, the, 643, 644.
Stephen, author of the life of Stephen of Obaize, 312 and n. 2.
Stephen de Ansa, 606.
Stephen de Borbone, 606, n. 4, 607, n. 1.
Stephen Gobarus, 390.
Stephen Harding, Cistercian abbot, 252.
Stephen Langton, cardinal, 174.
Stephen of Obaize, abbot, 242, n. 1, 312 and n. 2, 351.
Stephen of Tournay, 205, n. 1, 416.
Stettin, history of its conversion, 11–16.
Strangers, care for, 294, 295 (214).
Strasburg, 74, 421.
Strick, priest, 40.
Studies, 357, 401, 402, 414–416.
Stylite at Thessalonica, 532.
Stylites, 529 and n. 2, 532.
Subordination, 569, 574, 590.
Substance and accidents, 447. See Lord's Supper.
Substitutes, 201, 206.
Suffragan bishops, 215.
Suger, abbot of St. Denis, 140, n. 4.
Sunday, observance of, 9.
Superior, 276, (magister), 267, (generalis minister), 268.
Supernaturalism, 324, 338, 466, 473, 570. See Miracle, Grace. Supernatural Revelation, 429, 430.
Superstition, 328. Connected with the sacraments, 45, 338. Among the Tartars, 48. See Images, Miracles, Saints, Relics, Witchcraft.
Sutri, treaty at, 133.
Svantovit, idol of Rügen, 31.
Sweden, 90, 164.
Sword, order of the brothers of the, 45.
Sword, spiritual and secular, 106, n. 4, 130, 151, 165, 186, 190, 586. Bernard, 189. Humbert, 190. Joachim, 223.
Syneisaktes (Subintroductae), 249 and n. 1, 633.
Synods, annual, introduced by Gregory VII., 89. Provincial, authority defended, 131. Endemic, at Constantinople, against sects, 563, 564. See Councils.
Syzygia, 568.

T.

Tanchelm of Flanders, 592.
Tarraco, Waldensians at, 613.
Tartars, 624. See Mongols.
Tauris (Tabris), 57.
Tebald, 206, n. 2.
Teleology, 466, 490.
Temple, order of the knights of the, 258.
Temples, destruction of pagan, 14, 15, 21, 22, 30. At Jerusalem, 590.
Temudschin (Dschingiskhan), 48, 49.
Tertiarii, 276.
Tesserants, 565.
Thaddeus de Suessa, statesman, 184.
Theobald, count of Champagne, 236, 245, 255, 374, 383.
Theocratic system, 592, 605. See Papacy.
Theodora, mother of Thomas Aquinas, 422.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 495.
Theodoric, converter of Lieflanders, 37
Theodoric of Thuringia, 302, n. 2.
Theodoric of Verdun, 99, n. 6.
Theodorus Lascaris II., 542, 543.
Theodosius, bishop of Constantinople, 535.
Theodosius, emperor, 110.
Theological culture 413–416. See Scholasticism, Schools, Studies.
Theology, 426–485. See Doctrine, God, Character of, among the Scholastics of the thirteenth century, 427. Aquinas on, 431, 432. Bacon, 434, 435. Lull, 437, 438.
Theophanies, 445, n. 4.

Theophylact, bishop of Achrida, 530.
Θεοτόκος, 533, 557.
Thesaurus meritorum supererogationis, 349.
Thessalonica, 530, 531, n. 1.
Thibault II., 300.
Thomas Aquinas, 280. Defence of the mendicant orders, 286–288. Preaches in Italian, 317. The immaculate conception, 332. Sacraments, 335, n. 3. Transubstantiation, 339. The Lord's Supper under one form, 344, notes 1, 2, 3. Merita supererogationis, 349, n. 1. Indulgences, 350 and n. 1. Character, 421–423. On revelation, faith, nature of theology, 429–432. Knowledge of God, 444. Aristotle de Causis, 445. David of Dinanto, 446, n. 1, 447. Against pantheism, 449. Against Averrhoes, 449, 450 and n. 1. Omnipresence of God, 452. Omnipotence, 456. Trinity, 463. Doctrine of creation, 466. Doctrine of miracles, 471. Foreknowledge and predestination, 477–481. Man's original state, 491 and notes, 492. Original sin, 495. Doctrine of atonement, 506. Incarnation and original plan of God, 508. Faith, 511, 512. Justification, 512, 513. Uncertainty with regard to the state of grace, 513, 514. The Sacraments, 514, n. 5. Freedom and grace, 518, 519 and n. 1. Doctrine of morals, 519. Cardinal virtues, 520–524 and n. 2. Adiaphora, 524. Consilia and praecepta, 525, 526. Magnanimity and humility, 526, 527. The intention and the execution, 528. The everlasting gospel, 619, n. 1.
Thomas Becket, 168, n. 2, 169–172. Letters of, 169, n. 3.
Thomas de Celano, disciple of Francis of Assisi, 60, n. 2.
Thomas of Cantipre, 211, n. 5, 277 and notes, 278–282, notes, 285, notes 5, 7, 342, n. 5, 343, n. 1, 418, n. 4, 582, notes 4, 5.
Thoughts, evil, Anselm and Bernard on, 240, 241.
Threida (Thoreida), 37, 40.
Timur Khan, 57.
Tithes, 41, 138, 147, 149, 191.
Tocsin, the, 610.
Toulouse, Catharist council at (an. 1167), 590. Inquisition at, 581, notes 6, 9, 582, n. 2, 584, n. 3, 631, n. 2, 643. Henry of Cluny at, 603. Sects, 639. Count of, 641, n. 4, 642, n. 1.
Tournay, school at, 357, 359, n. 3.
Tradition, church, 355, 370, 420, 575.
Traducianism, 495, 573.
Transubstantiation, doctrine of, 335–341. Waldenses, 614.
Tribur, assembly of princes at, 111, 112.
Triers, heretics at, 609.
Triglav, Slavic idol, 14.
Trinitarians, order of the, 267, 268.
Trinity, doctrine of the, 334. Roscelin, 360. In Scholasticism, 457–466. Raymund Lull, 66, 69. Joachim, 227–232. Abelard, 377, 385, n. 4. The three ages (see Joachim), 447, 448. Bogomiles, 556. Catharists, 571, 574. Pasagii, 590.
Trinity, festival of the, 333, 334.
Tritheism, 360, 461.
Troubadours, 604 and n. 3.
Troyes, 383.
Trullan council, II. (an. 691), 334, n. 1.
Tunis, Raymund Lull at, 66, 67, 71, n. 2.
Turin, Waldenses at, 609, n. 3. (See Claudius.)
Tyrol, the, Dolcino in, 630.

U.

Ubald, bishop, 206, n. 2.
Ubiquity, 345.
Udardus. See Odo.
Udo, bishop of Triers, 111.
Ulric, companion of Otto of Bamberg, 2, n. 1, 20, 21, 25.
Unbelief, 229, 324–328 and n. 2.
Unction, 562.
Unity of the church, Joachim, 225. Catholic idea of, 268.
Universities, 68, 70, 421, 422. See Bologna, Palenza, Paris, Oxford, Salamanca. Monastic influence in the, 281, 284. Condition of the, 413–416. See Schools.
University at Paris, 282, 283. See Paris.
Unjust steward, parable of the, 553, 572.
Urban II., pope, 121–125, 128, 129, n. 4, 132, 136, 140 and n. 1, 153, 168, n. 2, 198, 201, 246, 252, 348, 349, 364, 536.
Urban IV., pope, 341, 421.
Usda (Uscz), castle, 7, n. 1.
Usedom, history of its conversion, 18. Assembly at, 22. Otto and Wartislaw at, 24.
Usher, bishop, 608, n. 1.
Utrecht, church of, 592, n. 2.

V.

Valentinian II., pope, 111.
Valentinians, 569.
Vam-Khan, 47.
Venice, peace concluded at, 168.
Verden, 33.
Vicarii, 212.
Vicelin, converter of the Slavonians, 33–36, 303.
Victor III., pope, 121, 124, 349.
Victor IV., pope, 167, 168, 218.
Vincentius de Beauvais, 50, n. 2.
Vincentius of Lerins, 537.
Virgil, 178, n. 3.
Virtue, Berthold, 318, 319. Virtues of the heathen, Abelard, 378, 379, 383, 384, 528. The Scholastics on the virtues, 519–528. Cardinal and theological, 520–523. Exemplares, 524. Order of reason, 521, 522, 524.

Vis conservativa, 482.
Visions, Gaudentius, 42. Raymund Lull, 61, 62. Bernard of Clairvaux, 252, n. 3. Francis of Assisi, 271. Innocent III., 272. As witnesses of the truth, 332. Anselm, 368. Hildegard, 217. Elizabeth of Schonau, 217. Cæsarius, 239, n. 2. Berthold, 266. Rainer, 326, n. 2. Corpus Christi, 341. The Greek monks, 529.
Visitations, 16, 36, 211, 213.
Votum, 578.
Vows, 237, 238, 306.
Vulgate, 425, 568, n. 3. Emendation of the, 426.

W.

Waldemar, king of Denmark, 31.
Waldenses, 229, 272, 303, 321, 324, 592, 605–616.
Walter, abbot of Melrose, 328, n. 1.
Walter, abbot of St. Martin (of Pontoise), 97, n. 8.
Walter Mapes, Franciscan, 608 and n. 1.
Walter of Mauretania (à St. Victor), 380, 381, 393, n. 1, 410, 450.
Walter von der Vogelweide, 173, n. 1, 216, n.
Waltram, bishop of Naumberg, 98, n. 1, 100, n. 3, 110, 111, n. 2, 113, n., 115, n., 116, 117.
Wartislav, Pommeranian duke, 1, 7, 9, 16, 18, 24.
Weavers, 603, mystical tendencies among, 565.
Wends, Christianity among them, 31, 32–36. See Pommerania.
Western Church, relation to the Eastern, 458, 528–551.
Western empire at Constantinople, 539.
Wezel, 161, n, 2.
Wheat and tares, parable of the, 589.
Wibald, envoy, 161, n. 3.
Wibald of Stavelo, 144, n.
Wilhelmina, 638.
William, abbot of Cluny, 263.
William, abbot of Hirschau, 86, n. 4.
William, abbot of Melrose, 328, n. 1.
William, archbishop of Bourges, 213, n. 2, 336, n. 2.
William, bishop of Alby, 577, n. 5.
William, bishop of Modena, legate, 41.
William, Cluniacensian abbot, 263.
William, Count of Aquitaine, 145.
William de Champeaux, 373.
William of Aria, 448.
William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris (Gulielmus Alvernus), 307, 326, 336, n. 3, 413, n. 7, 423, 432, 506, 519, 523, 616, n. 7.
William of Auxerre (Antissiodorensis), 350.
William of Puy Laurent, 611, n. 4, 614, n. 1.
William of Rubruquis, Franciscan, 51–56.
William of St. Amour, 282, n. 4, 283–286, 285, n. 5, 288, 289, 300, 301, n. 1, 303, and n. 4, 316, 618, n. 3, 619 and n. 3.
William of St. Thierry, 393.
William of Thoco, 422, n., 423, notes.
William of Tyre, 125, n. 3, 126, n. 3.
William of Utrecht, 109.
William Roskild, 206, n. 5.
William the Conqueror, of England, 87, n. 3, 88, n. 1.
William II., of England, 364.
William II., of Sicily, 530.
Witches, Witchcraft, 90, 91 and n. 1.
Witstack, Stettiner, 26–29.
Wladimir of Plozk, 36
Wladislav, Hermann, Polish duke, 4, 6.
Wolgast, history of its conversion, 19–21.
Wollin, history of its conversion, 3, 9–11, 16.
Women, in Pommerania, 8. Promote monasticism; pious mothers, 233, 234, 249, 252, 422. Fallen, Robert of Arbrissel, 299. Stephen of Obaize, 312, n. 4. Berthold, 310. Henry of Cluny, 600. Influence of, 141, n. 1. Female benevolent societies, 267. Order of St Clara, 276. In the begging orders, 286. Waldenses, 321, 611. See Beguines, Elizabeth of Hessia, Hildegard.
Word, 623. Roger Bacon on the power of the, 474.
Works, good, 305–312, 579. Compare Opus operatum. Outward works.
World, renunciation and appropriation of the, 525.
Worms, 74. Assembly at (an. 1076), 106–109. Concordat of (an. 1122), 143 and n. 5.
Worship, Christian, 293–354.

Y.

Yago (Iago) di Compostella, 298, 306.
Ὕλη, 462, n. 1.
Young men in the spiritual orders, 280, 281, 284, 286.
Yves of Chartres. See Ivo.
Yves of Narbonne, 583, n. 2, 584, n. 2.
Yxküll, in Liefland, 36–38.

Z.

Zacharias, 396.
Zacharias, pope, 110, 111.
Zähringen, duke of, 177.
Zelantes, 291, 617.
Zigabenus, Euthymius, 530.
Zwentipolk, son of Henry the converter of the Wends, 32.

PASSAGES FROM ANCIENT WRITERS

PARTICULARLY NOTICED IN THIS VOLUME.

Abaelard. Comment. in ep. ad Roman. p. 385.
Abaelard. Dialogus, p. 451.
Acta Sanctor. ed. Bolland. Mens. Aug. t. i, f. 549, p. 269.
Acta Sanctor. ed. Bolland. Mens. Oct. t. ii, f. 699, p. 60.
Acta Sanctor. ed. Bolland. Mens. June, t. v, f. 661, p. 61.
Bernhard. Clarav. epp. 189, 195, p. 148.
Canis. lectt. antiq. ed. Basnage, t. iii, p. ii, p. 2.
Eustath. Thessalonic. p. 531.
Euthym. Zigab. Panoplia, p. 555.
Fabric. Biblioth. eccl. p. 418.
Innocent the Third, epp. l. xiii, l. xv, p. 43
Joach. de Flor. ed. Colon. p. 312, p. 135
Martene et Durand Thes. nov. anecdot. t v, f. 217, p. 84.
Martin. Polon. Supputationes, p. 445, n. 4.
Muratori Scriptor. rer. Ital. t. i, p. 627, t. ix. 448, p. 628.
Nicetas de Comneno, l. vii, c. vi, p. 535.
Wilkins, Concil. Brit. t. ii, f. 172, p. 628.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE WHICH OCCUR IN THIS VOLUME.

Exod. 17 : 12, 205, n. 4.
Levit. 15, p. 306.
Deuteron. 18 : 1, p. 568.
Joshua 6 : 26, p. 189.
2 Samuel 3, p. 162.
1 Kings 16 : 34, p. 189; 18 : 19, p. 266; 19 : 11, p. 316.
2 Kings 2 : 25, p. 266; 4 : 25, p. 266.
Psalms 31 ; 2, p. 509; 51 : 5, p. 331; 53 : 1, p. 441; 55 : 8, p. 250; 72, p. 203, n. 1; 73 : 26, p. 260.
Proverbs 8 : 22, p. 569.
Ecclesiastes 19, p. 396.
Isaiah 7 : 9, p. 369; 9 : 6, p. 554; 11 : 2, p. 522.
Jeremiah 1 : 10, p. 251; 48 : 10, p. 89.
Ezek. 13 : 18, p. 243.
Hosea, 1, p. 132; 8 : 4, p. 160; 13, p. 332.
Micah 1, p. 132.
Mal. 2 : 12, p. 94.
Sirach 18 : 1, p. 568; 19 : 4, p. 375.
Matthew 6 : 16, p. 285; 10 : 9, 10, p. 2, 272; 10 : 27, p. 323; 11 : 6, p. 574; 11 : 27, p. 381; 12 : 17, p. 574; 15 : 24, p. 568; 18, p. 572; 19 : 11, p. 94; 23 : 3, p. 196; 23 : 5, p. 59; 23 : 15, p. 284; 25, p. 298.
Luke 1, p. 396; 10, 406, 572; 11 : 27, p. 574; 11 : 41, p. 306; 12 : 48, p. 53; 18 : 22, p. 283; 18 : 28, p. 262; 22 : 32, p. 33, n. 2.
John 2 : 3, p. 574; 4 : 22, p. 72; 5 : 17, p. 227, n. 1; 6 : 40, p. 382; 7, p. 575, n. 7; 8 : 44, p. 567; 9 : 60, p. 314; 10 : 16, p. 568, 13, p. 612, n. 3; 14 : 9, p. 881; 15, p. 406; 16 : 7, p. 330; 16 : 13, p. 382; 17 : 3, p. 381; 18 : 11, p. 215; 18 : 31, p. 214; 19 : 23, p. 285; 21 : 21, p. 228; 21 : 23, p. 228.
Acts 8 : 20, p. 152; 12, p. 122.
Romans 3 : 23, p. 509; 5 : 12, p. 493; 10 : 8, p. 431; 11 : 11, p. 72; 11 : 26, p. 74; 12 : 1, p. 241; 13 : 1, p. 160, 202; 14 : 17, p. 241.
1 Corinth. 7 : 9, p. 94; 10 : 4, p. 576; 12 : 28, p. 160; 13, p. 250; 13 : 12, p. 381; 14 : 19, p. 214; 15 : 46, p. 492.
2 Corinth. 10 : 5, p. 431.
Ephes. 4 : 16, p. 160.
Philipp. 3 : 20, p. 575.
1 Thess. 4 : 13, p. 250.
2 Thess. 2 : 3, p. 202, n. 6; 2 : 6, p. 619.
1 Tim. 1 : 7, p. 537; 4 : 8, p. 241, 262; 5 : 23, p. 250.
2 Tim. 2 : 4, p. 158; 2 : 25, p. 72.
Hebrews 11 : 1, p. 397, 430.
1 John 1 : 8, p. 288.
James 2 : 10, p. 348; 5 : 20, p. 586.
Revelat. 10 : 10, p. 625; 14 : 6, p. 518; 21 : 12, p. 625.

Date Due			
Ja 7 '47			
Ja 21 '47			
F 4 '47			
F 2[illegible] 48			
Mr 10 '48			
MR 2 '50			
FE5 '51			
FACULTY			

BW903 .N344 1872 v.4 RES STORAGE
General history of the Christian
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00085 8136